

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW.

Vol. V.—APRIL, 1880.—No. 18.

PUBLIC EDUCATION IN FRANCE—THE FERRY BILL.

Les Erreurs de M. Spuller sur le projet de loi de M. Ferry. Paris, Lecoffre fils, 1879.

Les Débats de la Commission de 1849. Par H. de Lacombe. Paris, 1879.

Rapport de M. Guichard sur le budget des Cultes. Paris, Victor Palmé, 1878.

Enseignement Secondaire congréganiste. Paris, Jacques Lecoffre, 1879.

FRANCE is now passing through a political and religious crisis, formidable in many respects, very hopeful in many others. The religious side of the question, which is the only one of which we intend to treat, hinges altogether on the alternative of freedom of education or the reverse. The subject, consequently, cannot but be of extreme interest to the Catholics of the United States, since it happens that they also have to guard their right of securing the religious education of their children. A clear statement of the actual position of French Catholics will, therefore, be instructive to all of us in this country, and on this account it is undertaken in the present paper.

If the spectacle presented by the attitude both of the enemies and the friends of Christianity in the French republic is attentively studied and accurately appreciated, it strikes the mind at once as one of the most remarkable and interesting in the whole course of French history. For the stern determination, the free-spoken defiance, the certainty of success, displayed on both sides, leaves no room for doubt or hesitation about the matter which is in dispute; and this is certainly of the highest order in point of

national interest. Is Christianity, that is, Catholicity, to continue in France or not? This is the question; and although the party of M. Gambetta hypocritically pretends not to aim at religion, he himself, the party's leader, openly declared it when he said: *Le cléricalisme, c'est l'ennemi*. Every one understands that *cléricalisme* means Catholicity.

But the Church is not dead, and does not want to die. No one would have suspected forty years ago that there could be so soon so great a revival of religion in the upper classes of that country. For it is not the clergy alone who show vigor, energy, and strength. Laymen without number, of every station in life among the educated part of the population, speak and write with the same frankness and uncompromising firmness as do the most energetic, talented, and eloquent bishops. This is a feature peculiar to this epoch, which the writer thinks has never before been witnessed in France, in the same degree. And in the ardent conflict, thank God! the intellect, the science, the real literary and oratorical talent are undoubtedly on the Church's side. She must win in the end!

Let us enter directly into the subject. The attacking party follows a very simple and plain policy. Let the education of the rising generation, in all its degrees, be left entirely to the control of the state; and as the state is now, and will, they hope, continue to be godless, in twenty years there will be no religion left in the country. This, they imagine, is the best means to establish in France the republican form of government. They seem firmly convinced that Catholicity is monarchical, and thus they identify politics with religion, and they must in the end adopt open persecution as a political measure if their adversary should let them go as far as that. Let us first look at the question in past ages.

Until the revolution of 1793 no one dreamt in France that education could be an exclusive attribute of the state. The idea that teaching was altogether under its control, so that no one could open a school except with its permission and under its strict supervision over all educational details, took its rise during that period which has been justly called the Reign of Terror.

In mediæval times, until the fourteenth century, the teaching body received all its powers and privileges from the Church. Not only was every one left free by her to open a school, but the zeal of the learned to impart their knowledge to others by teaching was always encouraged. The freedom was so complete that often teachers of error arose who had to be brought to reason and sense, as was the case with Abelard and many others.

From the fourteenth century down to the eighteenth the state shared with the Church the power of supervision, but it continued to be understood that the ecclesiastical authority was paramount,

and the governmental action was limited to the enforcement of orthodoxy, on which the social welfare of the people rested. Consequently all the teachers in public schools, particularly in universities and colleges, were either secular or regular clergymen. The idea that laymen alone can teach—*l'éducation LAÏQUE*, as it is now called—is a ridiculous pretension, which does not go farther up in time than the last twenty years. A decree of the Convention, it is true, forbade to former religious and clergymen to teach in schools; but as at that time there were absolutely no schools of any kind in France, that decree fell flat and was never revived since. Meanwhile the upholders of the freedom of education in the ominous struggle which is at this moment going on in the new French republic, can point with pride to the fact that the teaching imparted to the nation by clergymen during nearly a thousand years, has been productive of the most magnificent results, and during a long time placed France intellectually at the head of Europe.

There was, however, a decline, of which it is important to speak briefly. The so-called *revival of learning* previous to and coeval with the Reformation, was not an absolute blessing, as is sometimes pretended. In France, particularly, it introduced into literature a mawkish imitation of the old pagan authors, and Greek mythology became an almost universal element in poetry, and to a certain degree in eloquence. In philosophy it evidently disposed the minds to an antagonism towards theology, and produced an incalculable injury to the cause of truth. But with all these disadvantages education, being always in the hands of the clergy, remained on the highest level. It penetrated Christianity to the core, and the great French writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries carried the literary art almost to perfection. It is then that the French language became the usual channel of social intercourse among educated Europeans of all nations.

With the spread of infidelity, however, the eighteenth century witnessed a thorough revolution in literature, though the education of young people remained the same. Religion was first insidiously, then openly attacked by a set of sophists who took the name of philosophers. It is known that to their pernicious doctrines must be mainly attributed the civil and social commotions which after a hundred years are still as violent as ever. What was then the state of education in the country? and must the evils referred to be attributed to it? A respectable clergyman, *l'abbé Gaume*, has written many volumes to prove that the chief cause of the Revolution and of its consequences was the classical learning imparted in the French schools, in which the pagan authors of Greece and Rome were exclusively studied. This is not the place to enter deeply into this question. The single fact to which we must limit

our remarks is that public education was still at that time entirely in the hands of the clergy, and they could not be even suspected of intending to bring back France to paganism. If the reading of Latin and Greek authors by boys in colleges brought them naturally and necessarily to despise religion and become infidels, how is it that in the previous century—the seventeenth—the same baneful effect did not follow in France? Why is it that in other European countries, in England, for instance, where the same classical authors were studied perhaps more thoroughly than on the other side of the Channel, no effect of this kind was produced? There must have been some other cause than the one assigned by M. Gaume, and none can be perceived other than the revolution in literature mentioned a moment ago.

Although education was in good hands and perfectly free, the deleterious doctrines of the *philosophers* had altogether shaken the influence of the Church. Rousseau particularly had undermined all the bases of the former Christian educational system by his *Emile*, and the country was prepared for a thorough revolution in education as well as in literature.

The Constituent Assembly of 1789 and the following years, in preparing to give a new Constitution to France, began its work by the destruction of all previous institutions. Thus, together with the monarchy, the whole social, civil, and religious system, was swept away. The parliaments, the nobility, the provincial privileges, the Church organization, having been either altogether destroyed or essentially modified, the old system of education could not continue to exist; and university after university, college after college, primary schools in cities, and village schools in the country, were the successive objects of as many decrees which demolished them root and branch. The Legislative which followed the Constituent Assembly finished at last the unholy work, and when the last blow was struck France remained without public teaching of any sort.

The Convention in 1793 had thus a fair field for its theories. Its first attempt at reorganization was to revive the Spartan system. The children were declared to belong to the state, not to their parents, and this is the Satanic origin of all the educational nonsense that has followed, and it is also the origin of the present attempt of M. Ferry and his friends to revive the now exploded idea that the state alone is the instructor of youth. I call it "exploded," because freedom of education having been granted in 1850 and 1875, France had then acknowledged that the children belong to their parents.

To understand it better still, however, this interesting history must be continued. The Spartan system, as it has been called, consisted in bringing out the children, boys and girls, for the cele-

bration of *fêtes républicaines*, teaching them the new creed contained in the farrago called *les droits de l'homme et du citoyen*, swearing hatred to monarchy, singing patriotic hymns such as *La Marseillaise*, and in general living in the open air in the midst of the violent commotions peculiar to that period of anarchy. Seldom indeed did these forlorn children employ any of their time in study. The Convention itself, having abolished all the previous teaching as monarchical and superstitious, could not find leisure for prescribing a new plan of studies. The celebrated Abbé Grégoire, constitutional bishop of *Loir et Cher* (this was his new title), who was publicly appointed to report on a suitable educational system, often, it is true, read long rigmaroles, which were supposed to devise the best plans of encyclopædic instruction. But whatever may have been the cause, an attempt was never made to open schools, and give those *plans* the benefit of a trial. And this continued the whole time that the *Convention* and the *Directoire* lasted. Until Napoleon came, consequently, nothing was done, except to establish the fatal principle that the children belonged to the state, which was the only recognized *instructor*.

The emperor eagerly adopted this principle in laying the foundation of his *Université de France*. To the Church, which he condescended to reinstate at the same time, he left the direction of philosophical and theological studies for the candidates to the priesthood; nothing more. His profound sense told him he could not be the head in spiritual matters; but he insisted that not a single child destined to be a citizen, not a priest, should receive instruction from any one but from his state professors. The new bishops were too prudent to thwart him in that object, and besides they had not at that time the means of opening colleges of their own independent of the state body called the *Université*, had they been free to do so.

The Bourbons who succeeded to Napoleon fell in naturally with the same idea, because they thought it gave them a great opportunity of gaining over the new generation to the adoption of monarchical principles. It was a huge mistake, as the sequel showed, but it was natural for them to fall into it. Charles X. in 1828 went even further, though reluctantly. The Jesuits having, at the instigation of some bishops, opened eight colleges under the name of *Petits Séminaires*, a royal ordinance, prompted by the universal outcry of pretended liberals, closed them by authority; and members of religious congregations were declared incompetent to teach, unless they were authorized by the government. From that moment the distinction came into use of religious corporations *authorized*, that is to say, recognized by the state, and those which were not so authorized.

At the downfall of Charles X., in 1830, a new charter having been framed on the accession of Louis Philippe, an article was inserted into it promising freedom of education. It was the first time since 1793 that this word was pronounced, and became the object of a solemn promise. But it took the whole reign of the new king of the French,—fully eighteen years,—to frame a project of a law, which could scarcely claim even the appearance of freedom. The fatal principle of '93 had so profoundly entered into the heads of all French politicians, that it seemed impossible to recover so precious a liberty after it had been denied during thirty years. The chief cause of this delay, from 1830 to 1848, was the political antagonism existing between M. Guizot and M. Thiers. These two gentlemen were for a long time directing alternately the cabinet of the king. It was not, as in England, a contest between Whigs and Tories, but between Guizot's theory of resistance and Thiers's phantasmagoria of liberalism. When one was in the other intrigued to put him out. M. Guizot, in order to *resist* democracy, wished to grant to the Church some share in public instruction. But M. Thiers was always in the way, and used all his power to secure to the state *Université* the continuation of its teaching monopoly.

At last the revolution of 1848 broke out and threatened to plunge France into anarchy. M. Thiers, himself, perceived his imprudence. The excess of the evil became the cause of an unexpected freedom. As the laws that were then enacted to bring in that immense boon, and the astonishing results that followed, were the chief cause of the wrath engendered in the hearts of miscreants such as are undoubtedly the leaders of the actual crusade against religion, it is proper to speak of those laws and of their results at some length.

All the governments that succeeded each other since the first republic had labored under the same delusion, namely, that state training for the young generation was the best, because it would, in the end, render the nation homogeneous, and no more split up in parties, and that the attachment of all to the ruling form of government would be secured by the united efforts of able and devoted professors, and through the friendly bias that would be given to the studies, particularly of French history, and of the modern institutions adapted to the peculiar constitution of the times. Thus Napoleon I. began with the cry of *Vive la Gloire!* The Bourbons followed with the old motto *Vive le Roi!* Louis Philippe thought he had invented the precise device needed in the combination of *Ordre et Liberté!* All of these rulers would have been afraid of interference on the part of other teachers than their own; either laymen with republican ideas, or religious corporations laboring

more for the Church than for the state. They all had found the ground free for their experiments, owing to the despotic principles of the Convention, and thus they arranged, skilfully in their opinion, their plans of national education, with the intention of moulding the French into willing slaves.

Still they all had failed. Napoleon saw the French, satiated with glory, prefer his rule to that of the Bourbons. This new dynasty could not revive the former enthusiasm for the cry of *Vive le Roi!* in spite of its able and devoted professors. Louis Philippe, finally, had not united the nation by his pretended union of *Ordre et Liberté*. The popular insurrections which had upset three thrones, one after the other, were invariably led by the pupils of the state schools. It was a feature equally remarkable in the revolutions of 1830 and of 1848. The students of the *Ecole Polytechnique*, particularly, had organized the mob in the streets of Paris, and enabled them in great part to defeat the plans of the government with its troops of soldiers, infantry, cavalry, and artillery. Thus, all the monarchical training the young men had received in the state institutions had served only to make of them radical republicans, or, rather, anarchists. M. Thiers saw it in 1848, and being truly a statesman he directly perceived that religion must go hand in hand with instruction in the education of youth. France had never been so much in danger of being plunged into the horrors of anarchy as she found herself in 1848. M. de Montalembert had for a long time already started his war-cry of *freedom of education to all*, and the strange spectacle was offered of the Voltairian Thiers, with his friend, the rationalist, Cousin, joining hands with Montalembert, Dupanloup, and De Falloux. This requires some explanation.

This last gentleman, De Falloux, was appointed Minister of Public Instruction, in December, 1848, by General Cavaignac, then President of the Republic. The following January he formed two committees,—*extra-parlementaires*,—that is, their members were not all taken from the legislature. The first one, to the number of ten, was intrusted with the task of revising and adapting to the present circumstances the laws on primary instruction previously enacted in France. The other, comprising twelve members, had the same object in view with regard to the laws on secondary or collegiate instruction. Soon they were merged into one, and it was decided that the minister himself, M. De Falloux, should preside over them. In his unavoidable absences M. Thiers occupied the chair. The chief intention was to give to primary education a stronger Christian character, and to prepare a law which should be presented to the legislature, in order that secondary

or collegiate instruction should be henceforth free to a great degree, and not left entirely under the control of the state university.

To begin this work M. Thiers wrote a letter, published in all the papers, in which he openly declared the change of his views. He had a far greater influence over the French mind than any statesman in the United States could ever possess, for there is in this country a far greater degree of independence in individual citizens than there can ever be in France. A few passages of that letter deserve to be quoted: "When the state university followed the views of a wise and conservative *bourgeoisie*, when it taught our children according to Rollin's ideas, and gave more of its attention to the old classical studies than to the physical and mechanical theories confined to the narrow circle of so-called professional training, I was in favor of denying to all else the faculty of teaching. But this is not the case to-day. The state university has fallen into the hands of phalansterians, and evidently wants to teach our children, together with some mathematics and natural sciences, a great deal of *demagoguism*; I do not see any way of saving the country except by granting freedom of teaching. I repeat what I have already said: The education given by the clergy, which I did not like for several reasons, seems to me far better than what our state professors prepare for us. . . . My antagonism is now turned against the social enemy, which is the mania of the demagogue. I do not intend to surrender to it. I wish to save from destruction the last hope of social order, which is evidently attached to Catholic institutions."

Then followed, between the twenty-two gentlemen appointed by the minister, a most interesting discussion, which lasted in numerous sittings a great part of the year 1849, and has been published by M. H. de Lacombe. The most frequent interlocutors were, on one side, Messrs. Thiers, Dubois, Cousin, De Corcelle; on the other, Messrs. Dupanloup, De Montalembert, Laurentie, Cochin, De Riancey. The chief measures agreed upon were, first and foremost, liberty granted to all corporations acknowledged by the Church, not excepting the Jesuits. M. Thiers first thought them unpopular, and wished them to be excluded. But M. Dupanloup spoke eloquently in their favor, and asserted that the Church would never consent to their exclusion, because they were innocent of all the accusations brought against them, and the Church always stood up for justice.

In general, throughout all those discussions, the future Bishop of Orleans showed such a firmness joined with moderation, such a clear insight into all the questions connected with public instruction, that he finally convinced M. Thiers of the justice of his views, so that the great adversary of the Church's right in his previous

life completely surrendered, and brought M. Cousin to the same acknowledgment.

Besides the liberty granted to religious corporations, and to the secular clergy, with regard to secondary instruction, it was agreed that in the lower grade of teaching, namely, in the primary, the Church should enjoy a high control over the state instructors, who would be placed under the supervision of the *curés*, though not dependent on them. This was an immense advance upon the previous arrangement, when the schoolmaster was altogether independent of the priest, and often took pride in opposing him. Meanwhile, the religious bodies whose object is the direction of village schools, or of primary schools in cities, could be invited by the *communes* to all establishments of this nature, and their members needed not to be subjected to examinations, as the appointment of their superiors sufficed. It was from this time that the numerous schools of the Christian Brothers, particularly, obtained the pre-eminence they have now obtained throughout France for the education of the people.

To regulate the freedom granted for secondary instruction, it was agreed that all citizens, lay or clerical, and all members of religious corporations, even of those not legalized by the state,—this meant chiefly the Jesuits,—could open free colleges, with the government sanction; and that their pupils could be admitted to literary degrees after an examination before a mixed board, composed, half and half, of professors of the state university and of members of the religious body to which the college belonged. The state university was to continue to enjoy some privileges of supervision over those establishments, but these were very simple and not liable to abuse. From that moment the schools established by the various orders of the Church obtained an exalted position in the public education of the country. It is proper to consider here, for a moment, the astonishing success which has crowned their efforts, particularly because this success is the true cause of the attempt made by the present radical government to do away with them. The party to which the destiny of France has unfortunately lately been intrusted, perceived that the educated classes in France were on the way of being converted to religion, and that soon France would be again a Catholic country, in case her Catholic schools continued to flourish. *Inde iræ*. The Ferry bill was the result.

Before 1850 the Church's teaching was strictly confined within the precincts of the episcopal institutions, to prepare candidates for the priesthood,—*Petits et Grands Séminaires*. Not a single school could be opened by bishops and religious orders out of the narrow limits of priestly education. What do we find was the case in 1876, just before the present administration of the country un-

dertook to close at once all the free establishments under the care of the regular clergy? In 1878 M. Bardoux published officially, for the government, the general statistics of education, and it is from his report that the following details are taken concerning the free colleges opened by the secular and regular clergy. With regard to the episcopal *Petits Séminaires*, M. Bardoux remarked that he did not intend to speak of them, but *their pupils were about 30,000 in number*. We will go still farther than he did, in abstaining from speaking of many schools; and as religious congregations alone are threatened by the Ferry bill, nothing will be said here, either, of 91 episcopal institutions outside of the *Petits Séminaires*, or of 129 houses which are in the hands of the secular clergy. Still this wealth of educational means in the Church's hand took its rise only from the freedom granted in 1850. But we will confine ourselves only to the free establishments of religious corporations. These, according to M. Bardoux's report, were 89 in number in 1876. Not a single one of them existed prior to 1850. Of these 27 belonged to the Jesuits. Since the chief object of the Ferry law is to strike at them, it is proper to single them out. M. Ferry said, in one of his late speeches, that "the soul of France was, through those establishments, in the hands of the Jesuits."

The number of pupils in the 89 houses belonging to religious corporations was 19,960; say 20,000. Of these, 9131 (nearly one-half) were under the care of the Jesuits. Several free colleges belonging to the regular clergy prepared, also, young men for admission into the Polytechnique School, into that of St. Cyr for army officers, and into the Naval, the Central, and other schools. M. Bardoux, in his official report, spoke only of the admissions to the Polytechnique School and to that of St. Cyr, and confined himself to the single year 1876. He evidently wished not to call the public attention to the wide influence of the religious corporations in teaching, consequently he merely mentioned 39 admissions to the Polytechnique School, and 127 to St. Cyr. Another report from authentic documents, published by M. de St. Genest, says that the Jesuits alone, between 1850 and 1876, have successfully prepared 458 young men for the Polytechnique; 1248 for St. Cyr; 189 for the Naval School; and 288 for the Central School. This is the sore spot in the eyes of M. Ferry and his friends. It is evident that the religious congregations in France, owing to the freedom granted them, have been taking a deep hold on the intellectual classes in the country. A few years more of the same educational training, and the army, the navy, the engineering corps, the various branches of the civil administration, will be full of gentlemen educated by members of religious orders, to whom they remain ever after strongly attached. Have we not heard, a few weeks ago,

General Farre, the new Minister of War, an ardent supporter of godless education, exclaim that he will have trouble in reducing to his own way of thinking a large number of army officers who have openly fallen into the meshes of *clericalism*, that is, who bravely, and in the eyes of all, practice their religion?

But besides this remarkable change in military and civil circles there is also the greatly larger one of 20,000 young men who now follow their collegiate course under the care of religious, and have done so for many years past. In the next twenty years how many will have received a like religious training? What prodigious changes will it not have effected among the educated classes of the country? The effect which has already been produced could not have been expected twenty years ago. It has been described in a few spirited paragraphs by M. de St. Genest in his *Persécution Religieuse*, of which it is proper to transcribe here a few words. He contrasts the actual state of the country with respect to genuine religious feeling with what it was in appearance under Napoleon III., when he went with Eugénie to Notre Dame d'Auray, just before this remarkable transformation began to be perceptible in the intellectual and wealthy classes of society.

"I have known other times. I have seen the result of purely state religion. I have witnessed the pompous festival of *St. Anne a' Auray*, when I followed with my regiment the Emperor and his court, accomplishing an official pilgrimage. The priests on that day appeared to be invested with a great power; religion seemed to triumph indeed. Nevertheless I must say, that if we all assisted at that Mass, in a splendid order of battle, I saw few men around me showing unmistakably the faith of a Christian.

"What is the cause of the great change that has since happened? How is it that to-day the churches are too small, the Christian schools and the convents too narrow for their inmates? What has been the source of this new piety, so strange in regiments of soldiers, among burghers, and in the popular ranks? Has there been a thaumaturgus, another Peter the Hermit preaching a new crusade? No! These multitudes have been converted neither by a Lacordaire, nor by a Dupanloup. It is you atheists, it is you radicals, it is you demagogues that are the cause of it. Your voice is the one which calls these legions and sends them to the four quarters of the globe. As soon as they hear it, many of them run to the Sanctuary of St. Martin at Tours, others to Lourdes, not a few to Rome, some even to Jerusalem.

"When you attack the Brothers, the Brothers do not know where they are to find room for the children that come to them. When you threaten the priests, the priests are embarrassed by the great number of the faithful that surround them. You are the

new preachers sent by God; you are indeed the Fathers of the Church!

"If the pupils of the schools of every degree, if those young men formerly scoffers and skeptics, give the astonishing spectacle of which the whole of Europe speaks; if at St. Cyr all those brave young soldiers walk up to the altar headed by their officers; if large crowds of people are now seen walking in procession through France with their banners and holy images, it is to you that we owe it; yes, to you, the slaves of the Beast, the enemies of God. Go on, therefore, and continue to persecute! It is the breath of air which starts again the blazing flame when it was nearly extinguished!

"You have forced us to openly recognize all the grandeur of our Church. You have made us spew out the poison that was tainting the blood in our veins. . . . Go on! Let the horror that your very sight excites in us prove stronger than even Christian eloquence. You see it; at the first view of this impious war, we all rush on to the rescue; old men and young men; military people and civilians; noblemen and burghers; city and country people together. Directly the processions begin, and we turn pilgrims of God! It is a universal, unheard of conversion. What an admirable work you have been the innocent cause of! Let me tell you, however, in conclusion, that you are great fools!"

This is but a specimen of many outbursts of eloquence and pathos. Paul Féval is not the only one to speak and write in this apocalyptic language. He is not the best of them. The attempt of M. Ferry has elicited many other professions of faith from the pen or the lips of ardent laymen led on by the great Albert de Mun, all now engaged on the side of religion and truth. The cause of it, as assigned by M. de St. Genest in the previous passage, is true in great part. But it would not have taken place had not the eighty-nine educational establishments, founded by religious corporations since 1850, formed within their holy precincts the characters of very many of the young men, who now fill important offices in all the branches of the civil and military administration. From 1875 a much greater impetus was to be given to the holy cause by the law for *superior* education passed at Versailles in that year, by which the bishops were empowered to found Catholic universities for the highest branches of learning. Five of them were just being opened when the Ferry bill came to threaten their existence. A word must suffice on this subject.

It was Napoleon III. who, satisfied with the result of the freedom granted to the Church for primary and secondary education, thought of crowning the whole work by adding at once the privilege of the full university course. A committee was appointed to

frame the project of a law for that purpose. M. Guizot consented to preside over it, and two of its most eminent members were M. Prevost Paradol and the Père Captier, who was later on put to death by the Commune. The downfall of the Empire prevented the completion of the undertaking. But directly after the Franco-German war, Count Joubert introduced on his own responsibility in the National Assembly at Versailles, in 1871, a bill on the freedom of superior education. It was only four years later, after many incidents, delays, and obstacles, that the bill at last passed, opposed to the last by Messieurs Challemel-Lacour and Paul Bert, but, strange to say, supported by M. Jules Ferry, who was then a member of the Assembly. It seems he had not yet received his cue from the Masonic lodges, and in giving his opinion, after the passage of the bill, he used the following expressions:

"You have just concluded a grand affair, gentlemen; you have ratified a great project, in which I have concurred with you. You have just proclaimed the freedom of superior education; the free diffusion of doctrines not only by individual citizens, but likewise by religious corporations. It is a noble experiment, a great novelty in this country. Pause awhile, and do not incumber the project with doubtful adjuncts," etc.

The bishops did not delay making use of that precious liberty. In two or three years five of those immense establishments were founded, namely, at Paris, Lille, Lyons, Angers, and Toulouse. The French people of every class contributed generously. From two to five millions of francs were realized for the foundation of each of them; for of necessity they were to rival the state universities, and that of Paris in particular. The best talent was engaged for the schools of arts, medicine, law, philosophy, and theology. Large libraries and rich collections of everything necessary for scientific studies were purchased. Students flocked to them from every part of France, and, to the astonishment of all, in five of its great cities the highest courses of learning were opened to Catholic young men, on a par with the most celebrated in the country. Parents did not fear in them the teaching of atheistic and materialistic doctrines, as was too often the case in state establishments. At the end of every year, too, the number of young men admitted to degrees was comparatively greater than in the state institutions, though half of the examiners were members of the rival establishments. This was a climax that nobody expected, and which gave the clearest proof that France was Catholic to the core.

But this of course alarmed the enemies of religion, who before imagined that France had lost her faith. For a long time it had lain dormant, and the noise made, as usual, by the infidel party had

generally convinced people that the Church would never again obtain the control of the educated classes. All were profoundly surprised at such a revival as this. The anti-clericals, as they were called, were dismayed at this spectacle, and keenly felt they had no time to lose in opposing so formidable an antagonist as the Church unexpectedly proved to be. They had lately acquired in politics an immense power, owing to circumstances which cannot even be hinted at here, and they made up their mind to use that power instantly. In Freemasons' lodges particularly, to which many men belonged in the administration, in the legislature, and in the press, a plan of attack was quickly devised, which seemed to them sure of success. It was nothing else than the intention of returning to the former state monopoly in education, by following the lead of Prince Bismarck in his *Kultur-kampf*. It is true, two recent laws, which had proved a great success, would have to be abrogated; but could there be a better example to follow than that of the great Chancellor of Germany? After all, if it was a hazardous project, something must be done, and it would be folly to wait for a better opportunity.

The first intimation of it was given in 1877 by M. Guichard, in his report on the Budget of that year, when the national expenses for public worship came to be examined. He boldly asked that among the ordinary appropriations granted for the *Grands Séminaires*, seventeen of those Episcopal establishments should be deprived of their usual allowance, alleging that pure dogmatic doctrine and pure morality were not taught in those houses; that pure doctrine was not, because first, the four articles of the Gallican declaration, in 1682, were openly attacked by the professors of divinity; and, secondly, in moral theology, probabilism and many other lax opinions were advocated.

This proposal on the part of M. Guichard supposed that the state was intrusted not only with the general instruction of the people, but as well with the teaching of theology, which had been recognized even by Napoleon I. to be the province of the bishops alone. But since the *Kultur-kampf* of M. de Bismarck was to be taken as the model for France to imitate, it was thought to be better to adopt at once the whole of his plan, which they foolishly believed had already succeeded in Germany, and had there placed the Church in bondage. This, however, was too foolhardy on the part of mere political leaders of the stamp of Ferry and his compeers. It was asking more than they needed and more than they could obtain. It was proclaiming at once that they aimed at religion itself by attacking the bishops, whilst their best plan was to profess great respect for religion, for bishops and secular priests in particular, and declare war against religious orders only, which many inclined

to consider a useless appendage to the Church. Consequently the plan of campaign adopted inconsiderately by M. Guichard was promptly abandoned, and M. Jules Ferry, the new Minister of Public Instruction, gave a different turn to the attack by the celebrated bill which he brought to the Chamber of Deputies in March, 1879, and which is the proper subject of the present paper.

Two great objects were aimed at by this bill. First, it was an insidious attack against the Catholic universities lately organized; and, secondly, the religious orders not recognized by the state were to be deprived of the freedom of teaching granted them by the law of 1850. The designers of this project did not wish to appear opposed to freedom, except as against *foreigners* and open *enemies* of the Republic. They were great liberals, the leaders in fact of all *liberal* measures. The bishops, consequently, the secular clergy, the Orders even recognized by the state, would continue to have the liberty of education they enjoyed; only it would be better guarded by *some few* measures of their own device, which would give to the state a *little more* authority over them. These were certainly benevolent intentions. It remains to see how far they were sincere.

And first with regard to the Catholic universities, they would be, of course, respected; and the bishops would find that M. Ferry and his friends were not their enemies. Very little would be changed with regard to them in the provisions of the new bill. Only two small items would be insisted upon: the fees, which, according to the law of 1875, were paid by the Catholic students, would no more be exacted; and the examinations, which, according to the same law, were passed before a mixed board, would henceforth be left altogether to the State University professors, to whom alone fees would be paid. The fees previously paid for tuition and for examination were the only pecuniary resources of the Catholic universities, and M. Ferry and his friends thought that this single measure would oblige the bishops to close their establishments. Remonstrances were made on this point, but they were of no avail; and it seems strange that in all the excitement on the Catholic side which followed, far less energy was displayed against this part of the bill than against the article 7th, which excluded from teaching the religious not authorized by the state. The fact is that the Catholics were determined to keep their universities in spite of all obstacles; and if it came to the worst, and their resources were totally taken away from them, the Catholics, who had already found in their purse the many millions required for the foundation of those establishments, would also provide for their yearly maintenance. This was evidently the reason why so little noise was made against this outrageous feature of M. Ferry's project. The reader may be

assured that whatever may be the ultimate fate of this bill before the Senate, the universities will go on with more *éclat* than ever. The professors will be satisfied with their bare subsistence, all the expenses which are not absolutely necessary will be curtailed, and the French Catholics will find in their almost empty purses whatever will be strictly required. They are on their mettle, and nothing is impossible to them.

But the great battle has been fought and is yet raging on the article 7th. It is proper to give it in French: "*Nul ne sera plus admis à participer à l'enseignement public ou libre, ni à diriger un établissement de quelque ordre que ce soit, s'il appartient à une congrégation non autorisée.*" It is short and plain. If it becomes a law no man belonging to the congregations of the Jesuits, Dominicans, Oratorians, Benedictines, etc., will be able to teach in any school, lay or clerical. Consequently not only those orders will be forbidden to open any institution of their own, of whatever degree, but no bishop will be allowed to appoint any of their members to a chair of theology or philosophy in his *Grand Séminaire*, to a professorship of belles-lettres, or grammar, or even of simple elements in his *Petit Séminaire*, which is understood in this article as *public teaching*. The French, to their honor, felt the ignominy of such barefaced tyranny; and not only the Catholics themselves, but many rationalists, freethinkers, and Protestants joined, in the firm determination of uncompromising resistance. All those in fact who had adopted truly liberal ideas, and wished freedom for all, according to the motto of Montalembert, spoke in public, wrote in papers, and published powerful pamphlets where the cause of the Jesuits was openly advocated.

But it is time to look at the attack; the resistance will be better appreciated. The Committee in the Lower House appointed to report on the Ferry bill was, of course, ardently in favor of it. Every one knew that it would be carried in that Assembly without the slightest amendment. The composition of this body of legislators is truly inexplicable. Never since the first republic has any combination of public men showed such a disregard of justice and right. It is, however, the direct result of universal suffrage; but it is known how incompetent are the French to use this privilege with prudence and a right understanding of the common welfare.

M. Spuller, the chairman of the committee, presented his report at the beginning of June, 1879. It is important to attentively examine some of its points. It had a threefold object: to lay down the true source of power in point of public teaching; to discuss the objections that had already been made against it by bishops and other petitioners; to justify every article of the new bill. With regard to the first of these points the task of M. Spuller appeared

to him plain and easy, but was not so satisfactory to many of his readers. "The state is eminently the public instructor of the nation;" this was the principle on which all his argument was based. But this axiom needed first to be proved, and it was not. At all times and in all nations the parents have been considered the first instructors of their children. When they cannot do it themselves it is their right to look for other teachers in their place. As long as the children are under age the family is a unit, and the state cannot interfere except in the case of an open danger for the public welfare or of the violation of others' rights. Here the government pretended to see a danger, but no one else perceived it except the members of a party which called itself liberal and was in fact despotic. France had certainly never before admitted that the state alone can teach in so sweeping a manner as the Spuller report pretends it should. The proof of it was that in all the recent constitutions, except in the first followed by Napoleon, the freedom of education was promised as a corrective of the state influence.

Beside this first remark the reporter of the new bill did not clearly define what he understood by the state. This word has many meanings, as it is generally used. It may signify the totality of public institutions, or the administration in its complexity, or the executive alone, or finally a mere party which has obtained the governing power. M. Spuller did not seem to accept any of these interpretations, but he invented a new definition of his own which no doubt will startle the great majority of American readers. "The state," he said, "is a civil, lay, and political power, able to keep in check the pretensions of the spiritual authority!" This, in his opinion, was the great institution which was to be also "the public instructor of the nation." By its very essence it must be in a constant state of warfare against the Church.

M. Spuller, however, pretended to give proofs of his fundamental principle. He mentioned two in particular: the first was that freedom of education had never been granted by the state in France; just the contrary of the truth, except under the Convention. At all times, undoubtedly, unless during the first part of the Middle Ages, the state in France had extended its supervision over public teaching; but it is beyond contradiction that until 1789 the state left it entirely to the clergy, and never restricted its freedom. It only kept public order among the various institutions intrusted with it. For the religious orders taught concurrently with the universities, and it was proper that the state should interfere whenever a disagreement among them arose. This was then the only state interference in public instruction. This error of M. Spuller was immediately exposed and refuted in many pamphlets and speeches.

But his second proof was in some sense a still greater failure.

"Public instruction," he said, "is for the state an object of high interest;" and he concluded from this that the state must have the monopoly of it. At these words energetic and eloquent remonstrances came from all sides. For since the state must and does take interest in everything which concerns the citizens' welfare, it strictly follows that it must interfere in all those concerns, or rather take to itself the total management of them. This is well known to be the great principle of the rankest socialism of our day; and it was easy to convict the reporter of belonging to the sect of socialists, or at least of favoring and fostering it.

Meanwhile, in the midst of this fierce contest, the great danger to the Church appeared more ominous than ever. It has been stated that in presenting this bill to the legislature the government did not intend to alarm too much the religious interests. If the Catholic universities were "insidiously attacked," as was said, they nevertheless appeared to be safe from destruction. If some religious corporations (not authorized by the state) were excluded from teaching the whole body of the secular clergy were left as free as before, and even several orders of the Church (being authorized) could continue to teach. The real danger did not appear such as to excite the sudden outcry of execration that was raised on the part of the Church's friends.

But suddenly M. Spuller comes with his report, and he boldly asserts that in point of teaching the state is the only master, so that everything is despotically under its sway. At his bidding a certain number only of the colleges of the country under the Church's control are suppressed; but next year, if the same principles prevail, everything else bearing the religious character can be swept away like so many cobwebs. And that this was the real intention of these men seemed proved by the motto of their great leader, M. Gambetta, namely, that *l'ennemi c'est le cléricalisme*; and the object of the new bill with regard to the Catholic universities was unmistakably to end in their suppression.

This was sufficient to bind firmly together all those who took an interest in religion. There was no longer any fear that the secular clergy would see without dismay, and perhaps with a sort of satisfaction, the disappearance of a few of the regulars. The enemies of the Church had too openly showed the direct object of their attack, and the whole clergy of France, from the highest archbishop or cardinal to the humblest parish priest or curate, was as solidly bound together as if they had formed only a single bar of steel.

That the intention was to use this law as an entering-wedge into the most essential of the Church's prerogatives, was shown not by a few passages only of this political tirade, but by the whole

performance. The reason on which M. Spuller most insisted was the threatening aspect of ultramontaniam, which would ultimately triumph in France if the free colleges continued to exist. The Syllabus particularly was the bugbear evoked by the reporter. According to his wise arguments, if the Church wished to obtain the freedom of teaching, it was with the evident intention of concentrating it into her hands, and in the end excluding all lay teachers from this function. Texts were quoted by him from Catholic authors, whose words were tortured into a meaning which the writers never had. Nothing was better calculated to unite as a band of brothers all those who had the good of religion at heart; for the Syllabus and ultramontaniam, rightly understood, are now the Church's doctrine.

But the effect of this report went still further, and opened the eyes of many true liberals in France to the projects intended for the future. If this bill became a law, the despotic power which was supposed by M. Spuller to be the aim of the Church in asking for freedom, would be in truth vested by it in the state. This was tantamount to the establishment of a state morality and a state religion, which is perhaps the thing most abhorrent to the modern Frenchman. As the state, moreover, takes every day more and more the appearance of a party, if the dominant faction became at last that of socialism the way would have been paved by this bill for the crushing despotism which every one knows socialism keeps in store in case of its success. This was a sudden revelation for many men who cared little for the Church, and perhaps even dreaded her, but would never consent to take on their necks a far heavier yoke. Thus a considerable number of pure liberals, including among them even some avowed atheists or positivists, openly declared themselves against the passage of this bill, particularly against the seventh clause. They wrote letters in the public journals, made speeches, published pamphlets, increased the popular agitation in every possible way. This alarmed the party which had raised that storm, namely, the administration itself.

They wished to strengthen public opinion in their favor, and asked the Councils General of all the Prefectures of France to discuss the question among themselves, and express their views of it in their annual reports. From the reign of Napoleon III, and perhaps during the Republic which preceded it, these public bodies, which are composed of the most prominent men of each department, and are the official advisers of the Prefects, have become extremely influential, and on all great occasions they are consulted by the cabinet at Paris. A large number of new members had been lately elected, favorable, as was thought, to the projects of the government, and M. Ferry had no doubt that a thundering answer

would come from them to reduce to impotence the opposers of his bill. But he was sadly mistaken, and the result must have been far from pleasing to him. Of their total number, namely, eighty-seven, forty declared openly or indirectly against the bill; only sixteen voted unreservedly in its favor; thirty-one finally abstained from giving their opinion, which, consequently, could not be favorable. The papers which supported the measures of the government tried in vain to give a different turn to this result, and pretended to prove that the opinion of the Councils General was in the main satisfactory to the ruling faction. M. Spuller also in his report gave a garbled account of the general result, in which he himself evidently had no faith, considering his very embarrassed expressions. But these pretensions were so lame, and the real state of the case was so clear, that M. Ferry himself could not be blind enough to be inwardly pleased with the new aspect this incident gave to his expectations.

Directly after this first blow given to them, another, which he might have expected, came from the bishops. They all, without exception, protested against the bill. They sent to the legislature their remonstrances, and strong, indeed, they were, even in the short abstract of them which M. Spuller gave in his report. I translate from the French this short passage of it: "The complaints of the Episcopate can be reduced to three points, which we shall successively examine.

"First, the bill annuls, without compensation, just and legitimate rights previously acquired. It introduces into the legislation a fatal principle of instability, calculated to destroy the respect due to authority and law. It kindles again the flames of a war which had lasted fifty years, and which everybody thought had been ended by a happy and honorable compromise between the state and the Church.

"Second. The bill does not attack the freedom of superior education only, but it openly subverts the liberty of conscience by its seventh article, which denies the liberty of teaching in public and private schools to religious congregations unauthorized by the state.

"Third and lastly. The bill shows on its face the deliberate intention to impose on the nation, by legal means, an irregular teaching, in order to destroy Catholicism in France."

Pity it is that long extracts of this noble protestation of the French bishops cannot be given here. M. Spuller did his best to answer these eloquent objections. "The acquired rights," he said (meaning those of the Catholic universities), "date only from 1875." As this was uttered in 1879, I leave it to the reader to imagine how this answer would be received in any American legislature; and the more so that the reporter did not appear to

remember that the "acquired rights" of the free colleges dated from 1850, nearly thirty years. As to the instability of legislation to which the bishops had alluded with so much force, the same gentleman had nothing to answer except that every day a bill passed by one legislature is annulled by the next. Is this a pleasant feature of modern legislative enactments?

But as we cannot enter into the discussion of the whole report, something must at least be said of the last remonstrance of the bishops; namely, that the deliberate intention of the bill was to impose on the nation an irregular, that is, secular and state teaching, in order to destroy Catholicism in France. M. Spuller, alluding to this last objection of the bishops, said that this reproach was in effect that "the government wished to introduce a sort of French *kultur-kampf*. It went to a foreign country to find a political doctrine which is not, and cannot be that of France." But M. Spuller was immediately reminded that the very principles which were invoked in Germany for enacting the Falk laws were those he had himself advocated in his report. M. Falk, at Berlin, had no other object in view than to "protect the national spirit against the encroachments of Romanism," which is called *clericalism* by M. Spuller, at Paris. M. Von Lutz, the reporter of the Falk laws bill in Germany, assigned as the best reason of their enactment "the necessity for the state to create strong safeguards against the trespasses of the enemy." It is evident that the same objection can be raised in France against the pretensions of M. Spuller in France, which the eloquent bishop of Mayence, Von Ketteler, raised against the *kultur-kampf* in Germany, namely: "The Prussian legislation is intended to place the absolute omnipotence of the state in the hands of a man who does not allow any independence but his own, even in religious matters. The father cannot claim over his children the rights of paternity; he is only their guardian as far as the state will allow." Many other reflections of the same nature were made by the Catholics, showing the absolute identity between the tendency of the Ferry bill and of the modern German laws, which have culminated in a most crushing persecution. These few words abundantly prove that the reporter in France, in 1879, was not on a bed of roses.

His equanimity was still further disturbed by the immense mass of petitions against this bill, which about the same time were brought with solemnity to the Senate. The petitioners had not thought proper to send their signatures to the Lower House, where no justice, no fairness could be expected. They had only three months to draw and sign them before they were sent to Paris. The precaution was almost universally taken of having the signatures of less known citizens certified by some men of note in each district.

Still, at this moment (February, 1880), a great outcry is raised among the supporters of the Ferry bill, complaining of fraud, and asking that a strict inquisition may be brought to bear on those petitions. The object of this complaint is manifest from their insisting that M. Jules Simon should be excluded from participating in the inquiry, and offering his criticism upon it, though he is the reporter of the bill before the Senate. His perfect independence is well known, and it was also well known he would not be pliant enough to see fraud where there is none. A few days will decide if there is fairness among the majority of the Senators or not. But the following was the result of a three months' labor among the Catholics: one million four hundred and sixty-eight thousand signatures were obtained, and sent to the Senate Committee of which M. Simon is the reporter. There was evidently alacrity and goodwill in the performance of this great act on the part of so many French citizens. But it is most remarkable that the Catholics were not the only ones to do it. Many men who had opposed the Church all their lives, like M. Jules Simon himself; a goodly number of Protestants and Jews; even some avowed atheists and positivists like M. Littré, if I mistake not, wrote their names along with those of fervent children of the Church. And as the Catholic leaders are not only conscientious but are likewise sharp and wide awake, it will be difficult to convict them of fraud.

But what of the other party? Did they think of opposing petition to petition, and sending signatures in favor of the bill? They could not help it; they had to do it. To abstain from it would have afforded too clear a proof of their small number all over the country. Some of them even thinking that the majority of those who read and write in France were no longer believers in Christianity, imagined that a large majority would be on their side. To be, however, more sure of success, an awkward measure was adopted which proved in the end a ridiculous failure. In 1870, before the Franco-German war, a petition was started in France by the radical party, forming what they called *la ligue d'enseignement*. Three different forms of headings were used. One was in favor of *compulsory* instruction for all children; another asked that instruction should be *compulsory* and *gratuitous*; the last added the word *laïque*, meaning that laymen alone should teach. When the war began there had been just 266,480 signatures obtained on those three petitions. Their circulation was resumed in 1873, and three years afterwards (not three months), the total amount of the signatures affixed to the lists was 939,875. The first of those lists was not necessarily in favor of the Ferry bill, which could not be even mentioned in any of them, since in 1870, and even in 1873, there could be no question of the Ferry laws. In point of fact the free-

dom of superior education was granted in 1875 in spite of those petitions which had then ceased circulating. It was, therefore, "an awkward measure," as it has been called, or rather a pitiful trick, to bring them on in 1879 and oppose them to the Catholic petitions. The supporters of the Ferry bill, however, contended that the petitions for compulsory, gratuitous, and lay instruction, were a good enough answer to the opposing side, and here we must rest for the present.

A point of great importance in this animated discussion was the number of non-authorized religious congregations which were to be deprived of the faculty of teaching, the exact number also of their houses, and the total number of their pupils as well in the year 1879, as from the beginning of their operations. M. Spuller had endeavored in his report to place before the public all these statistical items, but whatever the cause might be, he had given a most false, nay, a ridiculous and absurd view of them. Then gentlemen engaged on the Catholic side quickly obtained reliable statements on all those questions and not only sent them to the legislature, but published them in all the papers.

On this subject a preliminary observation not altogether void of interest, is that the only "authorized congregations," on the part of the men, were the Sulpitians and the Christian Brothers; and among the numerous female corporations the "Daughters of Charity" were, I think, the only ones "authorized." It was found that there were 120 distinct congregations of women, and 16 of men, not "authorized." The female corporations possessed 555 educational establishments, and there were 89 directed by religious men. The number of teachers, on the side of the women, was 4857, and on that of the men, 1556. The pupils in the female establishments numbered 40,784. Those contained in male schools and colleges were 20,235. From the foundation of these establishments 486,527 female pupils, and 178,438 male scholars had passed through them. Being nearly all charitable as well as educational houses, in the last year 4008 *bourses* or *demi-bourses* were granted in the female establishments, and 3426 in the others. The total amount of money which was thus remitted to poor students, was 418,581 francs for the girls, and 765,095 for the boys.

This expresses the amount of mischief which the Ferry law was destined to do in France, in point of instruction and charity. The state was bound in duty to repair it directly by opening new houses of education, and granting like favors to poor students. This was a question of importance, which deserves to be considered by itself.

When in 1762 a decree of Parliament closed 124 Jesuit colleges, a great difficulty was immediately felt by the government. It was

thought at first that by confiscating the Jesuit property, and replacing by new teachers the religious who had been expelled, there would be no harm done. This appeared very simple, economical, and requiring little time. The college buildings had been kept by their former owners in good repair and order; they could be occupied immediately by the state, and in fact of the *lycées* and colleges now in the possession of the state in France, there are still sixty-six which have formerly been Jesuit establishments, so in 1762 there was no difficulty on that score. But it was not so easy to find teachers. As M. Villeman once said, "The Society of Jesus had left by its suppression a blank which it was not easy to fill."

At the present time the good luck of the government of Louis XV., which found so many handsome and roomy houses ready for occupation, cannot be expected by the rulers of France. The 558 establishments in the possession of female congregations, and the 89 occupied by regulars, cannot be confiscated at a single swoop. All those splendid buildings have owners who have complied with all the French laws regulating and securing property; and if a single attempt at confiscation took place, the courts would certainly decide against the government. M. Jules Ferry knows it, and he does not dream of attempting this step. He falls back on two measures which, in his opinion, are sufficient for his purpose. There will be room, he thinks, for many boys in the present *lycées* of the state. For the others he shall build; the girls can be accommodated anywhere.

But these two projects,—the free room in *lycées* and building,—have been proved to be entirely insufficient. The *lycées*, such as they are, are now full, and most of them, being old structures, can scarcely be warranted much longer by any board of health. Whilst on the contrary, most of the religious establishments, male and female, are splendid, airy, roomy, bran new, and delightful structures, to which for a long time the children of Catholics have been accustomed in France. As to building new houses, the sum of money required for this would be so enormous that no legislature could now consent to it. Details here would carry us too far, but let the reader imagine what it would cost to prepare at once buildings able to receive every day more than forty thousand girls, and more than twenty thousand boys or young men.

The question of the teaching-body necessary for the occasion, would be still more difficult to solve. It would amount to an absolute impossibility. Five thousand female teachers and fifteen hundred professors in colleges, offer thus a difficulty which no one could surmount in France. It is very probable that in case all this had been foreseen, after due examination, the project would have been essentially modified if not altogether abandoned. But in their

blind rage, anxious to stop the movement which was bringing back France to Catholicity, the originators of this scheme launched into an undertaking of the gravity of which they had only a dim perception. Now that they have pledged themselves to carry it through, they must go on in spite of all considerations; the more so as they are hounded on by Freemason fury, of which it is proper to say a word before concluding.

That Freemason lodges, organized in France from the beginning of last century, and at this time more rampant than ever, have been the main cause of all the revolutions which have disturbed the social state, not only in France itself, but in all the countries of Europe, is a fact which cannot be gainsaid, and of which the Freemasons themselves have often boasted. In spite of their pretended rule which forbids politics from being discussed in their assemblies, and welcomes to their ranks men of all political parties, they cannot now deny that they have been uppermost in nearly all the social and civil commotions that have agitated the Old Continent for one hundred and fifty years. At this moment they are most influential in all elections in France. They have a programme now well known, which all the members are sworn to execute. Each one of them has his part to accomplish, and none of them would dare to swerve from his allegiance to *the Grand Orient* in all the measures that have been adopted and are prescribed. M. E. d'Avesne has demonstrated all these points in a small volume published last year at Marseilles, entitled, *La Franc-Maçonnerie et les Projets Ferry*.

But the only matter of interest here is the influence of Freemasonry in the scheme and furtherance of these projects. M. d'Avesne proves that the bill itself comes from the lodges, and that a large number of members of this secret order are actively engaged in working for its success. Their great object is to destroy Catholicity, or rather Christianity, in France; and the bishops in their remonstrance did not fear to allude to this intention, though they did not point out the lodges as the great source of the evil. Many Freemasons in this country may, no doubt, demur from entirely believing this. For it is well known that for a long time Freemasons showed great respect for the name of God, and called him emphatically the great Architect of the Universe. In many places, no doubt, they allowed their members to profess the Christian religion, and Catholics even were admitted to their ranks without requiring from them an open apostasy. This is now entirely gone; and on the Old Continent at least the rankest atheism and materialism is openly professed in their assemblies, and the most violent hatred not only of the Christian doctrine, but even of the belief in God, is manifested on all occasions. But Catholicism is chiefly the

butt of their denunciations, the main object of their fury. The quotations given by M. d'Avesne, mentioning the names of their authors, are in the highest degree revolting; and we have not heard that any of those men openly accused of using such language, have denied it or called M. d'Avesne before a court of law. There is in particular a short passage attributed to M. J. Ferry himself, which has been lately copied and re-copied in many Catholic pamphlets, and which the Minister of Public Instruction in France has never thought proper to contradict or deny. These are the words which M. Ferry is said to have used in the lodge of "Clémentine Amitié," of which he is avowedly a member. As they cannot possibly be translated in English, we give them in the original language: "*L'Infâme qu'en vain avec le xviii-e Siècle on se flattait d'avoir écrasée, et qui renait plus vigoureuse, c'est la morale n'avançant qu'appuyée sur des béquilles théologiques; et pour tout dire en un mot, c'est l'embrigadement général de la Sottise humaine.*"

This picture of the state of parties in France is truly appalling. The Freemasons, animated with the spirit which has just been described, occupy many of the most eminent positions in the social and political world. Last year four of the ministers of M. Grévy were members of the order, namely: Le Royer, Lepere, Tirard, and Ferry. In the Senate M. d'Avesne gives us twenty names. In the Lower House it was still much worse. The President, Gambetta, was of course one of them. There were two Vice-Presidents out of four. All the chairmen of committees, except three, were on the same list. The same was true of the leaders of all the divisions of the *Left*; that is, of the great majority in the Chamber. Of the ordinary members I have counted just sixty.

Beside the executive and the legislature, the majority of the Municipal Council of Paris is composed of Freemasons. Hence a few months ago the schools, directed by Brothers and Sisters under the control of the Municipal Government, were taken from them and given to lay teachers.

It would be useless to go further in this investigation and show the power of Freemasonry in many other influential bodies in Paris; and in particular it would be impossible to recount in detail the number of journalists and publicists who belong to the order.

It was under these circumstances that this secret order attempted to take charge of education in the whole country; and to begin with it, the Ferry bill was elaborated as a first essay which should naturally lead to further projects. What will be its fate in the Senate cannot be altogether foreseen at this moment (February, 1880). It is, however, considered certain that its seventh article will be either expunged or essentially modified. Even if it should pass, it would only be the beginning of a prolonged agitation which

must ultimately end in freedom. The short sketch that has been drawn of the number, influence, earnestness, and talent on the Catholic side, cannot leave any doubt as to their ultimate success. Only a crushing persecution such as that which disgraced the first Convention, could temporarily prevent it. But in 1793 religion unfortunately could not sustain itself, because the lay element was altogether wanting. Even in the ecclesiastical body, even among the Regulars, there were scandals which, thank God! are not possible to-day. By the civil constitution of the clergy, schismatic bishops, and priests were directly placed at the head of all the dioceses and churches of France. To-day, if the ruling party went so far in its rage as to inaugurate an open persecution, the amount of devastation required would be so enormous that it would be impossible to carry it fully into effect.

The truth is that France is now divided into two camps; and the army of God is possessed of as much energy, talent, and wealth, as the rabble on the other side can boast of. The colorless description that has just been sketched in this paper, fails to give any idea of the sublime determination which animates the upholders of right. France is evidently destined to be altogether Catholic, and the leader of Catholicism all over the world. Look at her work in the missions of Asia, Africa, and Polynesia. Examine attentively what the children of the Church are doing over her continental possessions and in Algeria. See the immense multitude of religious, educational, and charitable institutions that have been lately founded. Ponder over the proud position taken by her sons in the intellectual world. Her Catholic universities will continue to flourish in spite of all opposition; and from the lips of her theologians, philosophers, and true scientists must come the solution of all the difficulties raised in this age by materialists and atheists. The time of delusion has passed for her. Infidelity had wellnigh destroyed her by reducing the opinions of her pretended men of science to disorganized fragments. Henceforth there will be unanimity in her thought, because she relies only on the solid anchor of truth, on the Catholic faith proclaimed by the lips of the infallible Pastor.

Since this paper was written the Ferry bill has been defeated in the French Senate. This was expected, but the majority against it was much larger than could well be hoped. In the absence of details recent telegrams attach great importance to this event. It seems that the party called Left Centre has openly separated from the remainder of the Left, and has refused to come to any compromise with the Ministry. In this case the Ministry will have to resign, having the majority against it. It is even said that there is no union in the Cabinet. It looks indeed like a complete disorgani-

zation of the radical party; and the government that has succeeded that of General MacMahon seems altogether unable to stand in the midst of warring elements. To increase further the hopes of the friends of religion, the mob has not appeared on the scene, though the Chambers are now sitting at Paris. The whole rage is now concentrated in the hearts of radical deputies and senators; and the fury of journalists and scribblers cannot succeed in rousing the rabble against bishops or Jesuits. This is the most hopeful feature of this revolution, for in all the bearings of the case it is a complete revolution. The struggle, however, is far from being over; the city of God cannot so soon obtain peace in France. Still, a great victory has been won; and all Catholics must pray that nothing comes to mar it, and prevent its fruits from being gathered in abundance after this blow inflicted on the godless party.

THE SIXTH NICENE CANON AND THE PAPACY.

Τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθνη κρατεῖτω τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ Λιβύῃ καὶ Πενταπόλει, ὥστε τὸν Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπίσκοπον πάντων τούτων ἔχειν τὴν ἐξουσίαν, ἐπειδὴ καὶ τῷ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπισκόπῳ τοῦτο σύνηθές ἐστιν. Ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ κατὰ Ἀντιόχειαν καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἐπαρχίαις τὰ πρεσβεῖα σῶζεσθαι ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις.¹

“**T**HOSE holy and venerable Fathers of Nicæa,” said St. Leo the Great,² “who, after having condemned to eternal infamy Arius and his blasphemies, enacted a series of church canons destined to have force to the end of times are not dead; for, both here at Rome and throughout the whole world they are judged to be still living in their immortal decrees.” We feel this undying influence of the three hundred and eighteen bishops just as vividly to-day, though nearly sixteen centuries have passed since they met in Bithynia, as St. Leo did fourteen hundred years ago. Of the twenty canons which they promulgated, not one has grown entirely obsolete; for the majority of them relate to things of catholic and fundamental interest, and the few which were enacted for the protection of assailed individual rights or the extirpation of local abuses have in them a germ of immortality.

Canon VI. is an instance of this latter class. The main object of the decree is to confirm the time-honored privileges of the See

¹ The rest of the canon deals with matters which do not here concern us.

² Ep. 106, ad Anatolium.

of Alexandria. From time immemorial the bishops of that city had claimed and exercised supreme jurisdiction over the churches of Egypt and the neighboring provinces. They received the appeals of the bishops from the sentence of their metropolitans; they convened and presided over provincial synods; they ordained and, if necessary, deposed bishops; in a word they were, in the phraseology of a later age, *patriarchs*. Whatever may have been the source of this authority, there is no record of its having been contested by any of the Egyptian bishops before Meletius of Lycopolis raised the standard of rebellion.

This Meletius, as we learn from Socrates,¹ having been degraded by St. Peter of Alexandria in consequence of many heavy charges, the most grievous of which was that during the persecution he had denied the faith and sacrificed, would not submit to the sentence of his superior; and not content with renouncing all allegiance to the Alexandrian See, he arrogated an equal right with the patriarch to ordain bishops and convene synods throughout Egypt. By attaching to his cause all the disaffected elements through the country, he sowed religious dissension in every parish, and soon was leader of a numerous and devoted faction, which obtained quite a formidable accession of strength by coalition with the partisans of Arius. Indeed the desire of putting an end to the Meletian schism was one of the chief motives which impelled Constantine, "with the advice of the clergy," to convoke the Nicene Council.

The great synod decreed "that the ancient order of things in Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis must be maintained, to wit, that the Bishop of Alexandria should have authority over all these provinces." And lest similar disorders might arise in Antioch or elsewhere, the Council enacted furthermore "that all the churches should keep their ancient standing."

The decree thus far is perfectly clear and reasonable; but it is not, to use St. Leo's term, *διανοητικόν*. Its importance has not survived the ravages of time. Many an age has rolled by since those brilliant luminaries of ancient Christendom—Alexandria, Antioch, Heraclea, Cæsarea, Ephesus—were extinguished. They were undoubtedly grand and princely in the day of their strength, but their greatness was of men and shared the inevitable fate of human things. Of what importance, save to the antiquary, are now those old Patriarchates with their accessories of high prerogatives, august state, and far-stretching boundaries? If it was permitted to those ancient princes of the Church to revisit these mortal scenes, their self-esteem would probably be less mortified by finding that every vestige of their patriarchdoms has been swept away, than by perceiving how

¹ Lib. i., c. 6.

wonderfully well the Church of Christ gets along without them. And upon turning their eyes Romeward and beholding the "Bishop of Old Rome" seated upon the Rock of Peter as firmly and serenely as ever, it is possible they might recall St. Leo's prophetic words: "A Church that is built upon any other foundation than that Rock which the Lord hath laid shall sooner or later come to grief."¹

This canon, therefore, owes its perennial interest to its incidentally alluding to the Roman Pontiff; for any scrap of ancient parchment upon which *his* name has been written cannot fail to interest Christians so long as the Vicar of Christ shall have friends or enemies. The importance of the document before us is greatly enhanced by the fact that it was the very first utterance by the Universal Church on the subject of the prerogatives of the Bishop of Rome. The Nicene Synod was the first of the Ecumenical councils, and was, consequently, the first occasion which offered itself to the Catholic Church of speaking in a corporate and official manner. Hence the historian and the controversialist turn eagerly to learn what the first of councils had to say about the chief of bishops.

Now if we sincerely desire to know what the Council really said, we must first of all discard translations and comments, and allow the canon to speak for itself. The endless controversies to which our canon has given rise would, in great part at least, have been avoided if this course had been pursued. Indeed, one of the main objects of this paper is to convince theological students, by an apt illustration, how necessary it is to study ecclesiastical documents in their authentic source and original dress of language. There is an impression abroad that in this day of elaborate translations there no longer exists a necessity for submitting to the drudgery of acquiring dead languages and poring over barbarous glossaries, and very many prefer the more facile method of transcribing the assertions of their predecessors to the laborious task of hewing their own inferences out of the original text. Now a translation is necessarily a poor substitute for the original; for if it were faithful and perfect in other respects, it must, like a false diamond, be lacking in weight and lustre.² Besides, whoever quotes from a translation quotes at second-hand, for a translation is nothing but the translator's expressed *opinion* of the sense of his text; and,

¹ Nec præter illam petram quam Dominus in fundamento posuit, stabilis erit ulla constructio. Ep. 104.

² What a world of wisdom is condensed into that little phrase of St. Jerome's, *Hebraica Veritas* (the Hebrew Text). And if it be permitted to look at the phrase from a different point of view, how much better it would be if we, spiritual children of Abraham, were as tenacious of the original *Veritas* as were the carnal seed of the Patriarch.

in consequence, is essentially an inference. And then, no matter how adequately the translator may have, himself, seized the meaning of his text, there will still remain room for doubt whether the words he has selected adequately embody that meaning. But what assurance have we that the version we are to rely upon is faithful? Will the fact of its being generally received as such vouch for it? Certainly not. An error, be it ever so common, is an error still; and an erroneous translation is all the more dangerous for having obtained universal currency, because one is the less inclined to suspect it.

Now applying these remarks to the subject we have taken in hand, let us put the question to prominent writers: What said the Council of Nicæa regarding the Roman Pontiff? 1st. The Protestant historians and controversialists, with a few honorable exceptions, will reply that whereas the Bishop of Rome, from being a simple bishop, like any other, had succeeded, before the date of the Council, in imposing his authority upon the bishops in his vicinity, the Council thought it proper to permit him to retain his usurped dominion; a course which they are free to deplore, since it encouraged the "ambitious Pontiff" to persevere in his fixed design of enthralling the Christian world. Hear Calvin on the subject:

"In regard to the antiquity of the primacy of the Roman See, there is nothing in favor of its establishment more ancient than the decree of the Council of Nice, by which the first place among the Patriarchs is assigned to the Bishop of Rome, and he is enjoined to take care of the suburban churches. While the Council, in dividing between him and the other Patriarchs, assigns the proper limits of each, it certainly does not appoint him head of all, but only one of the chief."¹

2d. Now turn to those Catholic writers of the Darras and Rohrbacher stamp, who seem to think that the office of the historian is

¹ Inst., b. iv., c. 7, Edinburgh version. Dr. Alzog (vol. i., p. 664, Cincinnati edition) must have been temporarily laboring under Calvinistic influence, when he informed his astonished readers that the "precedence of rank and authority possessed by Rome was CONFIRMED by the Council of Nice (Canon VI.)!" Not only is this assertion historically false, but it was resented centuries ago by the Roman Pontiffs. "The Nicene Synod," said Bonifacius I., "did not DARE make any enactment regarding the Bishop of Rome; well aware that no act of man could add glory to him who had received the fulness of power from the mouth of the Lord." "Adeo ut non aliquid super eum AUSA sit constituere, cum videret nihil supra meritum suum posse conferri; omnia denique huic noverat Domini sermone concessa." Ep. ad Episcopos Thessaliae. Compare Nicolaus I. ad Michaellem. "Si instituta Nicænæ Synodi diligenter inspiciantur, invenietur profecto quia Romanæ Ecclesiæ nullum eadem Synodus contulit incrementum: sed potius ex ejus forma quod Alexandriæ Ecclesiæ tribueret particulariter, sumpsit exemplum."

to copy bodily the assertions of his predecessors. According to these slashing authors, the Synod declared, *totidem verbis*, that "the primacy has always resided in the Church of Rome (Canon of the Council of Nice). Let the ancient custom, then, be vigorously maintained . . . for so the Roman Bishop orders."¹

To tell the truth, I have less sympathy with the second class of unscrupulous writers than with the first. Protestant writers, when they undertake to combat the Papacy, are struggling "with the sun in their eyes." Their position is obviously disadvantageous and paradoxical, and it is not to be marvelled at if they should grow desperate. But a Catholic writer, who is full certain that Truth and Catholicism are synonyms, ought to make every endeavor to find out the truth, and when he has found it to present it to his readers unvarnished; for every victory gained by our adversaries over the indolent stragglers from our ranks is accounted as a triumph over our sacred cause.

II. Now let us approach this famous document, and translate it as we should a passage from Thucydides:

"Let the ancient usage throughout Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis be strictly adhered to, so that the Bishop of Alexandria shall have jurisdiction over all these; since this is also the custom of the Bishop of Rome. In like manner, as regards Antioch and the other provinces, let each church retain its special privileges."

Confining our attention to the clause ἐπειδὴ . . . τοῦτο σύνηθες ἐστίν, let us at the outset assure ourselves that our translation faithfully represents the original. The term συνηθης, according to Hedricus, denotes *consuetus*, *familiaris*, and is translated by Liddell and Scott, *habitual*, *customary*. The phrase σύνηθες τι ἐστίν is equivalent to the well-known Latin expression *familiaire* or *consuetum est mihi*: *it is my custom*. It cannot be rendered, *It is the custom of others regarding me*. Hence Hefelé's rendering, "There is a similar custom for the Roman Bishop," is evidently incorrect. Da auch für den römischen Bischof ein gleiches Verhältniss besteht, Conciliengeschichte, vol. i., p. 389, new edition.

In fact, Hefelé was influenced by the old version of Dionysius the Less, who has rendered the clause thus: *Quia et Urbis Romæ Episcopo parilis mos est*. This is unsatisfactory; for there is no equivalent for *parilis* in the Greek text, and there is no equivalent in the Dionysian version for the Greek τοῦτο. The earliest Latin version—that which was read in the Council of Chalcedon—is more to the point: *Quoniam et Romano Episcopo hæc est consuetudo*; which coincides with our own. Protestant writers have also rendered the text as we have done, though naturally they strive

¹ Darras, vol. i., p. 387. Compare Rohrbacher (livre xxxi.).

afterwards to blunt the edge of it. Thus Sheppherd¹ translates it: *Since this is also the Roman Bishop's custom.* Neander:² *Since this is the custom also with the Roman Bishop.* Schaff:³ *Since this also is customary with the Bishop of Rome.* We are justified, then, in assuming that our translation is a faithful reproduction of the text;⁴ and may safely make it the basis of our further remarks.

III. After having determined with the greatest possible precision what the Council *said* about the Roman Pontiff, our next step is to investigate the *meaning*, the scope and bearing, of the words of the canon. "Let the ancient usage throughout Egypt, etc., be adhered to, so that the Alexandrian Bishop shall rule these provinces; *because this is also the Roman Bishop's custom.*" Now it is plain that Bonifacius and Nicolaus, as quoted above, were quite correct in affirming that the Synod made no enactment of any kind in regard to the Roman Pontiff. This canon neither grants new privileges to the Apostolic See, nor confirms any existing ones. For some reason or other, the Council did not think it necessary to legislate upon the Bishop of Rome. It strengthened the hands of the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, and of the Exarchs of Pontus, Asia, and Thrace. In Canon VII. it conceded a *Patriarchate of Honor* to the Bishop of the Holy City; but it did not DARE exercise, in any way, a legislative authority over the city of St. Peter.

Hence, Calvin's rhetoric evaporates like dew before the sun. The Council does not "divide between the Roman Pontiff and the other Patriarchs," but adduces the authority of the former as a *reason* for admitting the claims of the latter. But whence did Calvin derive his information about those "suburban churches" which the Pope was "enjoined to take care of?" There is no trace of this in the canon. The wily heresiarch knew well enough that he was not quoting "the decree of the Council of Nice," but Rufinus's corruption of that decree.

Rufinus wrote a History of the Church in continuation of the immortal work of Eusebius, and inserted in it a Latin translation of the Nicene Canons. But his character of rhetorician did not

¹ History of the Church of Rome, p. 63. It is about the only grain of truth I have discovered in his violent diatribe.

² Church History, vol. ii., p. 162.

³ History of the Christian Church, vol. ii., p. 275.

⁴ There is an untranslatable grace and force in the article prefixed to *Ῥωμῆν*. It breathes the deepest reverence. Observe that the article is not placed before Alexandria or Antioch, nor, as may be seen in the III. Canon of the Second Council, before Constantinople, whilst it invariably occurs before *Rome*. "Trifles light as air" oftentimes carry with them a great weight. Compare the little shibboleths *Our Saviour*, the *Blessed Virgin*, etc., which in the dialect of the modern Ephraimites become *the Saviour*, the *Virgin Mary*, etc.

permit him to give the decrees to his readers in the plain, unambitious style of the good Fathers of the Council. He was fain to embellish them and give them a high-sounding, antithetical form. The result of his lucubration upon our canon is the following sententious effusion: "Et ut apud Alexandriam, et in Urbe Roma vetusta consuetudo servetur, ut vel ille Egypti, vel hic Suburbicarum Ecclesiarum sollicitudinem gerat."¹

Now this "translation" ought to be brushed aside as undeserving of notice, and it is pitiable to see how much time and pains have been wasted by eminent scholars upon the barren task of determining what Rufinus meant by his "suburban churches." What did he mean by his whole translation? Did he understand it himself? As every one knows, Rufinus was the prince of bunglers. He was notoriously ignorant, and just as rash and stubborn as he was unskilful. His knowledge of the Greek was scanty, having been picked up without system or teacher. As for his Latin, the above specimen convinces us that he richly deserved St. Jerome's contemptuous criticisms.² It must be remembered, moreover, that shortly before writing his history he had been excommunicated for heresy by Pope Anastasius. Hence, we cannot expect to be assisted by Rufinus in our investigation of this subject. Let us return to the text.

The kernel of the difficulty is the demonstrative *τοῦτο*, *this*. "This is the custom of the Roman Bishop." What does *this* refer to? "Let the Bishop of Alexandria retain his ancient sway over these three provinces, for *this* is also the Roman Bishop's custom." According to Bellarmine and others, *τοῦτο* refers to the Patriarchate of Alexandria, and is to be expounded thus: "Let the Bishop of Alexandria continue to govern these provinces, because this is also the Roman Pontiff's custom; that is, because the Roman Pontiff, prior to any synodical enactment, has repeatedly recognized the Alexandrian Bishop's authority over this tract of country."³

¹ Hist. Eccl., lib. i., c. 6. For the benefit of those readers who may find it an arduous task to follow our sublime author through the upper air, I shall attempt a translation, though in the process much of the Rufinian froth must go to waste. The Synod decrees also (the rhetorician expects his readers to supply this) "that as well at Alexandria as in the city of Rome the ancient custom be preserved, that either the former (probably he means the Bishop of Alexandria) shall bear the solicitude of Egypt, or the latter (most likely the Pope) of the suburban churches."

² The saint has exhausted his copious vocabulary of vituperation upon his unfortunate adversary. He compliments his style as *slovenly, barbarous, unintelligible, solecistic*. "Such is thy skill in the Greek and the Latin, that when thou speakest in Greek the Greeks take thee for a Latin, and when thou speakest Latin, the Latins take thee for a Greek." *Apologia adv. Rufinum*.

³ Vera expositio est, Alexandrinum debere gubernare illas provincias, quia Romanus Episcopus ita consuevit; idest, quia Romanus Episcopus ante omnem Conciliorum

This exposition is unpalatable to the adversaries of Roman supremacy; hence they offer us a different interpretation. They make *τοῦτο* refer to patriarchates in general and expound the sentence as follows: "Let Alexandria have jurisdiction over these provinces, because the Roman Bishop has also a Patriarchate." "It illustrates the sort of power by referring to a similar power exercised by the Roman prelate in his province."¹

IV. Although this second exposition might strike the reader at first sight as being *possibly* correct, yet I trust I shall be able to prove that it is inadmissible; and that Bellarmine's is the only unexceptionable interpretation.

Let me, at the risk of being tedious, state, first of all, my understanding of the passage. The supremacy of the Bishop of Alexandria had been contested by the Meletian bishops. They had asked him, if not in words at least in facts, upon what warrant he based his claim to rule over and depose his fellow-bishops. If he had a title let him produce it. Now the Alexandrian prelate had no written document of any kind to produce. The Council of Nicæa, therefore, came to his assistance, by decreeing that the Patriarch's² authority must be respected, and that for two reasons: 1st, because it was *ἀρχαία, immemorial, aboriginal*; and 2d, because it was sanctioned by constant recognition on the part of the Roman Pontiff. Two very good reasons.

1st. The first argument in favor of this interpretation is drawn from the grammatical structure of the text. (*a*) Take the pronoun *τοῦτο* and see what it obviously refers to. Surely to this subject in hand, to wit, the ancient privileges and boundaries of the Alexandrian Patriarchate. It seems impossible, without quibbling, to refer the *τοῦτο* to anything else. The only objection which can be urged against this is the *καί, also*. What is the use of the *καί* in this interpretation? This objection is readily answered. The *καί* introduces a new and stronger reason why the Patriarch's authority should be respected. "Let the custom prevail, not only because

definitionem consuevit permittere Episcopò Alexandrino regimen Egypti, Libyæ et Pentapolis; sive consuevit per Alexandrinum Episcopum illas provincias gubernare. Bellarmine De Rom. Pont., lib. ii., c. xiii. He says there is no other plausible interpretation.

¹ Sheppherd ubi supra. "Since this also is customary with the Bishop of Rome (that is, not in Egypt, but with reference to his own diocese)." This is Schaff's clumsy paraphrase of the clause.

Many Catholic writers of eminence have interpreted the canon in this sense, but for the most part, they were interpreting, not the text, but the Dionysian version; and Dionysius was, no doubt, biased by the *Prisca*, which had adopted the gloss of Rufinus. The *Prisca* may be found in the Ballerini edition of St. Leo's works, vol. iii., p. 498.

² The word *Patriarch* is of later origin, but must serve in default of an equivalent.

it is ancient, but *especially* because it has Roman usage in its favor;" or, "Since even the Roman Bishop constantly recognizes it." (b) The word *συνήθης*, *customary*, is intelligible in our interpretation, but in the alternative it becomes absurd. "It is customary with the Bishop of Rome to recognize the Bishop of Alexandria as Patriarch," is clear and sensible; but, "It is customary with the Bishop of Rome to be a Patriarch," is devoid of sense.

2d. A second argument in support of our interpretation is elicited by considering the logical sequence of the passage. "This is the Roman Bishop's custom," is the Council's *reason* for supporting the Alexandrian claims. If it is a reason, we must reverentially presume that it is a valid one. The ancient fabric of the Patriarchate was tottering; the Nicene Fathers prop it up with this clause, which, therefore, contains a reason strong enough to sustain a Patriarchate. Now imagine Meletius demanding wherefore Lycopolis should be subject to Alexandria? If the Council be made to answer: "Because Tusculum is subject to Rome," would it not appear a "lame and impotent conclusion?" Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis must obey the Bishop of Alexandria; because this (not Egypt, etc., but Campania and the islands) is the Roman Pontiff's custom!¹ Besides, granting that Rome's possessing a Patriarchate were a valid reason why Alexandria also should have one, would it be a sufficient reason why the Alexandrian Patriarchate should extend just so far and no further? If so, then the following ratiocination must be considered sound: "Let the Alexandrian Bishop have jurisdiction over *three* provinces, because the Bishop of Rome is also a patriarch." Should any one rejoin that the reason why Alexandria happened to rule *three* provinces instead of two or four, was that this was the ancient custom, I answer that *his* reason is different from that of the Council, which tells us that "Alexandria shall rule these *three* because this is the Roman Bishop's custom."

Now take Bellarmine's view of the canon. "Why shall Meletius and all the other bishops of Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis acknowledge the supremacy of the Patriarch?" Because the Bishop of Rome has time and again recognized the authority of the Alexandrian Bishop over these provinces. "Where are the documents to prove this?" asks Meletius. "Documents are not necessary," says the canon, "custom has force of law. Has not the Bishop of Rome, ever since he sent Mark to found churches in Egypt, held the Bishop of Alexandria responsible for purity of faith and strict observance of discipline in that part of the world?"² What

¹ "Since this also is customary with the Bishop of Rome [that is, not in Egypt, but with reference to his own diocese.]"—SCHAFF, quoted above.

² When Pentapolis was devastated by the Sabellian heresy, Dionysius, Bishop of

could Meletius reply to this? If he and the Council admitted the Catholic doctrine of Papal supremacy, his mouth was closed. *Here* was a reason strong enough to sustain, not Alexandria merely, but, "in like manner, Antioch and the other great eparchies;" their authority was sanctioned by the Vicar of Christ. But if we assume that the Bishop of Rome was, in the opinion of the ancients, a simple bishop, like any other, what weight would his recognition of Alexandrian claims then carry with it? None at all. The Meletian would answer, "What care I for the favor or displeasure of a bishop a thousand miles away? What right has the Roman to recognize any one's jurisdiction in Egypt? Antioch is nearer to me than Rome, and so are Carthage and Ephesus; but the bishops of Antioch, and of Carthage, and of Ephesus know very well they have no right to meddle with things in Egypt. After having thrown off the tyrannical yoke of an Egyptian, is it probable that I shall be swayed by the opinion of a Latin?"

3d. We are now led to the threshold of a third argument, which I shall forthwith proceed to develop. The Council was evidently desirous of establishing the Patriarchates on the firmest possible foundation. Hitherto the Bishop of Alexandria or of Antioch,

As one secure
Sat on his throne, upheld by old repute,
Consent, or custom.

But "old repute" can uphold a throne so long as things go smoothly; but if there be no "strength concealed" within, the throne will fall to the ground at the first touch of a skeptical hand. Now, knowing as we do, that, so far as divine right was concerned, the Bishop of Lycopolis was the peer of the Bishop of Alexandria, upon what principle of ecclesiastical law could the latter base his claim to judge and depose the former? In other words, what was the original source of that patriarchal authority which the Alexandrian wielded? Every Catholic must answer that, whereas, *per se*, the bishops are mutually independent within their proper jurisdiction, they, of divine right, have no other superior than the successor of St. Peter, and, in consequence, a bishop who shall claim any legitimate sort of precedence or authority over a fellow-bishop, must of necessity found his pretension upon the expressed or tacit consent of the Roman Pontiff. In the Catholic system, then, "Alex-

Alexandria, exercised his patriarchal authority in extinguishing the evil. He was in consequence accused at Rome by his enemies as having denied the divinity of Christ. He purged himself of the charge, and was commended by the Roman Pontiff for his zeal. This incident, preserved by Athanasius, goes to show that there was a constant flow of intercourse between the two Sees, and explains the *custom* alluded to in the canon.

andria, Antioch, and the other eparchies," were exercising prerogatives which belonged, natively, to the chair of Peter, and we are forced to the conclusion that they and the Council were as sensible of this as we are ourselves. Therefore, the clause in question can bear no other interpretation than this: "Alexandria and the other great Sees must retain their ancient sway because the Roman Pontiff wishes it." Understood in this sense the *ἐπιστολή* places the archiepiscopal thrones on the firmest—and indeed the only firm—foundation. Why should we deem the Fathers of Nicaea either less "Roman" than ourselves, or less capable of comprehending their strongest argument in favor of Alexandria? Suppose a parallel case to happen in our own day and country. Suppose that, ages ago, the Roman Pontiff had dispatched to these provinces a missionary with episcopal ordination and unlimited, unwritten jurisdiction. If in course of time the throne on which "as one secure he sat upheld by old repute" should be shaken by an unruly suffragan, what might we suppose would be the ruling of a plenary Council? The Fathers would probably enact: That the authority of the Bishop of Baltimore must be respected; that it was unnecessary to apply to Rome for a formal recognition of his primacy, since the custom of the Roman Pontiff, invariably to address himself to the churches in these provinces through his medium, was an ample justification of his claim.

It may be objected that this argument would have no weight with Protestants. What of that? Are we to abandon our old standard of interpretation, our "Catholic analogy," because, forsooth, we cannot induce "those who are without" to view things from our standpoint? Let our adversaries prove that our interpretation is false; for the burden of proof is upon them.

4th. But we have a fourth argument, of which every historian must feel the force. I refer to the establishment of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. In my last argument, I took for granted that the only foundation upon which a Patriarchate could legitimately rest was the consent of the Roman Pontiff. This assertion we are able historically to make good, by observing a Patriarchate in process of crystallization.

Shortly after the date of the Nicene Council, the little town of Byzantium was by the genius of Constantine metamorphosed into Constantinople, the New Rome and Mistress of the East. With the magnitude of the city grew the importance and pretensions of its bishop, who now became the emperor's ecclesiastical adviser, the arbiter of bishops, the chief organizer of missionary expeditions, and the president of politico-ecclesiastical assemblies. A dignitary of such importance seemed to the emperor, the senate,

the metropolitan clergy, and the Eastern bishops,¹ to be deserving of the highest honor. Hence the second General Council (A.D. 381), in its third Canon, decreed that "the Bishop of Constantinople should rank in the Church next after the Bishop of Rome," giving as its reason that Constantinople was a new Rome.²

But this canon never obtained the *βεβαίωσις καὶ συγκατάθεσις*—the confirmation and consent—of the Roman Bishop, without which even the Byzantine was conscious that his authority was founded on the sand. Hence, in the fourth Council, taking advantage, as St. Leo has remarked, of the prostrate position of the churches of Alexandria and Antioch,³ the Bishop of New Rome, Anatolius, made a desperate attempt to gain a more solid footing for his Patriarchate. Pope Leo, in anticipation of this, had strictly enjoined his legates "not to suffer the Nicene Decree to be violated." The Fathers of the Council, however,—some no doubt for political motives, others because they were given to understand that Leo was not so much opposed to the innovation as his legates would have them believe,—granted the Byzantine the desire of his heart. But now the more serious task remained of inducing the Pope to ratify the decision of the Council. The Council wrote to Leo, so did the Emperor, so did the Patriarch; all begging the same favor, and all acknowledging that the validity of the act depended on his confirmation. "We make known to you furthermore," wrote the Fathers of Chalcedon to the successor of St. Peter, "that we have made still another enactment which we have deemed necessary for the maintenance of good order and discipline, and we are persuaded that your Holiness will approve and *confirm* our decree. . . . We are confident you will shed upon the Church of Constantinople a ray of that Apostolic splendor which you possess, for you have ever cherished this church, and you are not at all niggardly in imparting your riches to your children. . . Vouchsafe then, most Holy and most Blessed Father, to accept what we have done in your name, and in a friendly spirit (*ὡς οὐκ εἰς ἃ τε καὶ φιλα*). For your legates have made a violent stand against it, desiring, no doubt, that this good deed should proceed, in the first instance, from your provident hand. But we, wishing to gratify the pious Christian emperors, and the illustrious Senate, and the capital of the empire, have judged that

¹ "As to the new honors conferred upon my see by the late Council, let me assure your Holiness that I am not to blame in this matter. A man am I fond of retirement and quiet; from my earliest days content with a lowly station. But my reverend clergy are very eager for the advancement of their Church, and the prelates of the vicinity encourage and abet them." Anatolius to Pope Leo. Opp. S. Leonis, Ep. 13^o.

² Τον μέντοι Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐπίσκοπον ἔχειν τὰ πρεσβεῖα τῆς τιμῆς μετὰ τοῦ τῆς Ῥώμης ἐπίσκοπον, διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὴν νέαν Ῥώμην.

³ Dioscorus of Alexandria had been deposed, and Maximus of Antioch was a creature of Anatolius.

an Ecumenical Council was the fittest occasion for effecting this measure. Hence we have made bold to confirm the privileges of the afore-mentioned city (*θαυρήσαντες ἐχυρώσαμεν*) as if your Holiness had taken the initiative, for we know how tenderly you love your children, and we feel that in honoring the child we have honored its parent. . . . We have informed you of everything with a view of proving our sincerity, and of obtaining for our labors your *confirmation and consent*."¹

Anatolius writes to the same purpose: "The holy Synod and I have submitted this canon to your Holiness in order to obtain your assent and confirmation, which I beseech your Holiness not to withhold."²

And in a later epistle he assures the Pope that "the whole efficacy and ratification of the decree had been reserved to the authority of his Holiness."³

We have also two letters of the Emperor Marcian to Pope Leo, in which he acknowledges that the Pope's sanction is absolutely necessary to the validity of the canon.

"Since it has pleased the Synod to grant the Bishop of Constantinople the post of honor next after the Apostolic See, I pray your Holiness to give assent to this arrangement."⁴ And a few months later he writes endeavoring, with evident anxiety, to hurry on the cautious Pontiff.

"I am puzzled beyond measure to know wherefore your Holiness, although fully informed by the bishops assembled at Chalcedon of the proceedings of the Council, has not yet dispatched us *that epistle which must be read in every church, so as to reach the notice of all*. This delay has afforded an opportunity to the evil-disposed to suggest a doubt whether your Holiness would confirm the acts of the Synod. Deign, therefore, to send a letter which shall certify the churches and the faithful that the decrees of the Council have been confirmed by your Holiness. Very laudably, indeed, and with a constancy worthy of the Bishop of the Apostolic See, your Holiness has resisted the attempt which was made to disturb the ancient order of things as established by the canons. But you have, no doubt, been apprised of the active machinations of the enemies of the faith, against whom I have been unwilling to proceed because the Council's exposition of orthodox faith has not yet received your confirmation. I pray your Holiness, therefore, to send us a decretal with all possible dispatch, so that it may become manifest to all that you confirm the Synod of Chalcedon."

St. Leo readily assented to the emperor's request and ratified all the dogmatic decrees of the Council. But he and his successors

¹ Opp. S. Leonis, Ep. 98.

² Ep. 101.

³ Ep. 132.

⁴ Ep. 100.

resolutely condemned this surreptitious canon in favor of New Rome.¹ In consequence the *political* Patriarchate of Constantinople lacked ecclesiastical confirmation; and this 28th canon of Chalcedon was not admitted into the Greek synodical code until the Eastern Church had become thoroughly saturated with Byzantinism.²

Bring this analogy of a Patriarchate *in fieri* to bear upon the subject under discussion, and my former argument returns in a new shape. The Nicene Council desired to *confirm* the Patriarchate of Alexandria. Now the only way of accomplishing this was to show that the Bishop of Rome had "shed a ray of apostolic splendor upon his favored child." Therefore the clause, "Since this is the Roman Bishop's custom," must mean, "Since this is the Roman Bishop's will as expressed by custom."

5th. Another powerful argument in support of our interpretation of this sixth Nicene canon, is that the ancients saw in it a plain and formal acknowledgment by the Fathers of Nicaea of the primacy of the Apostolic See. Indeed, Pope St. Gelasius proclaims it an *invictum et singulare iudicium*. "By what process of reasoning can you persuade yourselves," he writes to the Eastern bishops, "that the rights of the other Sees will be respected, if due reverence be not paid to the supreme See of Blessed Peter,—that See which has ever been the support and bulwark of all sacerdotal dignity, and to which the *unique and irrefragable testimony* of the three hundred and eighteen Fathers acknowledges immemorial veneration."³ Hence, if we believe Gelasius, the Roman Pontiff's name was made use of by the Nicene Fathers to serve as a *support and bulwark* for the privileges enjoyed by "Alexandria, Antioch, and the other eparchies." The Emperors Theodosius and Valentinian also give expression to this widespread sentiment in their celebrated edict on the subject of the primacy of the Apostolic See. The civil power, they argue, must recognize the Bishop of Rome as Head of the Church, 1st, because he is the successor of St. Peter, the Chief of Bishops; 2d, because of the dignity of his city; and 3d, because his supremacy has been confirmed by the sacred council.⁴ Now the "sacred council," so far as we know,

¹ Consensiones episcoporum. . . . in irritum mittimus, et per auctoritatem beati Petri apostoli generali prorsus definitione cassamus.—St. Leo to Pulcheria, Ep. 105.

² There is grave reason to suspect that the Acts of Chalcedon have been tampered with by the schismatical Greeks. But since this cannot be fully demonstrated, there is no use of making the charge. Even as the documents stand, they furnish abundant evidence of the unquestioned supremacy of the Bishops of Rome.

³ "Qua ratione vel consequentia aliis sedibus deferendum est, si primæ Beati Petri sedi antiqua et vetusta reverentia non deferatur, per quam omnium sacerdotum dignitas semper est roborata atque firmata, trecentorumque decem et octo Patrum invicto et singulari iudicio vetustissimus iudicatus est honor." Apud Natal. Alexand.

⁴ "Cum igitur sedis apostolicæ primatum sancti Petri meritum, qui princeps est

had no other occasion of introducing the subject of Roman supremacy than this Alexandrian question, and to this sixth canon, therefore, as all admit, the Emperors were alluding. True, it may be objected that the Emperors' argument is based not upon the original text, but on the old Latin version, which contained the famous *additamentum*: "Quod Ecclesia Romana semper habuit Primatum." (The Bishop of Rome has ever been Head of the Church.)¹ It seems quite probable that such was the case, for the edict emanated immediately from the Western Emperor, and at the suggestion of St. Leo. But we cannot suppose, for a moment, that it was the Pope, or any of his clergy, who drew up the document, because the Roman Church would have vehemently denied that any synod did or could *confirm* its primacy. A score of years before, Bonifacius, in the epistle already quoted from, had expressed the views of the Apostolic See upon the attitude of the Nicene Council regarding the prerogatives of the Roman Pontiff. "Non aliquid super eum *ausa* est constituere." It follows, that the Latin version had passed the critical examination of the imperial lawyers, who would have been quick to detect an interpolation in the document, had there been one. But they took the *additamentum* for what it really was,—a title; and their understanding of the clause, *Episcopo Romano hæc est consuetudo*, was the same as the original translator's, the same as Pope Gelasius's, the same as Bellarmine's. It has, of course, been insinuated by hostile

episcopalis coronæ, et Romanæ dignitas civitatis, sacræ etiam synodi firmiter auctoritas," etc. Opp. S. Leonis, Ballerini, ep. xi.

¹ This variation is found in all the ante-Dionysian versions, as may be seen by consulting the Ballerini-Quesnel edition of St. Leo's works, vol. 3. Were this the proper place, it would be an instructive and amusing occupation to trace the process of corruption which our canon underwent as it passed through the hands of the successive editors. The *additamentum* was, doubtless, in the first instance, the title selected by the earliest Roman translator. Next, in the *Antiquissima*, the *Quod* was dropped. Then the following editors, thinking it necessary that each canon should have an appropriate title, and believing that the sixth had none, added the words: "De Primatu Ecclesiæ Romanæ." The editor of the *Prisca*, to make confusion worse confused, introduced the Rufinian jargon into the text, making the canon read thus: "De Primatu Ecclesiæ Romanæ vel aliarum civitatum Episcopis. Antiqui moris est ut urbis Romæ episcopus habeat principatum, ut suburbicaria loca, et omnem provinciam suam, sollicitudine gubernet. Quæ vero apud Aegyptum sunt, Alexandriæ episcopus omnium habeat sollicitudinem," etc. It is important to remember that the only version received by, or emanating from, the Roman Church, was that read by the Pope's legate at Chalcedon. The others were executed without Roman co-operation, by irresponsible parties in various parts of the West. These interpolations, therefore, can with no more semblance of justice be fathered upon the Roman Pontiffs,—as several Protestant writers have done,—than they can be upon the Nicene Council, as some Catholic authors have sought to do. To the Catholic who expresses indignation at Calvin's attempt to substitute Rufinus for the Council, and to the Protestant who is equally indignant at what I have termed the Darra-Rohrbacher substitution of a Latin version for the original canon, I can heartily exclaim, *Plus ego!*

writers, though somewhat timorously, that the Latin variation was a deliberate interpolation by the Romans with a view of extolling their chief; nay, some have even laid the blame of it upon the "ambitious Popes" themselves. I do not propose to enter largely into the uninvestigable question of determining the *intentions* of people who lived and died ages ago. The Bishops of Rome have ever been distinguished for scrupulous attention to the genuineness of their documents. From the earliest ages, the fact of a text proceeding *ex scriniis Ecclesiæ Romanæ*, was the best witness to its accuracy. The version of our canon which was read by Parchasinus at Chalcedon, is a faithful reproduction of the original. The words *Quod, Romana*, etc., cannot be called an interpolation, because they were not *inter*; they were *ante*; which is equivalent to saying, they were the title prefixed to the canon in the Roman Codex.¹

Now, therefore, the inference drawn from the text by the Latin translator was, that it acknowledged the primacy of the Apostolic See. This is all that we can expect to find in this title, and it is all that we seek to find in it. I have no doubt but the author of the translation considered himself justified in giving the canons what he judged to be the most appropriate headings, for the original had none. And what more felicitous heading than this could a Latin have selected? It was pithy and contained the very soul of the decree. "Let Alexandria, Antioch, and the other great Sees retain their privileges, because this is the Roman Bishop's custom." To a Latin, the particular privileges of the Eastern churches were a matter of slight moment. The only interesting feature of the canon to him, was that the Bishop of Rome's authority had been made the common basis and foundation of the various prerogatives of the individual churches. Is it not a strong confirmation of our own interpretation to know that it coincides with that of the contemporaries of the Council?

Dr. Schaff contends that this "interpolation" was rejected by the Greeks at Chalcedon. The only foundation for this assertion is that in the acts of the IVth Council, it is stated that upon the legate's reading the Nicene Canon as it stood in his codex, Constantine, the Greek secretary, read the same canon without the interpolation from the codex preserved in Constantinople. This

¹ "Trecentorum decem et octo Patrum Canon sextus; Quod Ecclesia Romana semper habuit Primatum; Teneat autem et Aegyptus, ut Episcopus Alexandriæ omnium habeat potestatem, quoniam et Romano Episcopo hæc est consuetudo. Similiter autem," etc., ap. Nat. Alex., Sæc. iv., Prop. ii., Disser. xx. The canon proper begins manifestly with *Teneat*. *Aegyptus* probably represented to a Latin mind that large extent of territory which the Orientals divided into Egypt proper, Libya and Cyrenaica.

is a feeble basis to build such an argument upon. For, first, Baluzius, Ballerini, and Hefelé contend that this repetition is not to be found in the manuscripts prior to Photius. But, secondly, if Constantine had read the canon again, for the grave purpose of denouncing a Roman forgery, or of resisting Roman encroachments, he would not have contented himself with a quiet re-reading of the canon. If, therefore, he read it at all, it must have been for the sake of preserving the verbal accuracy of the decree, which cannot but have suffered by the process of a double translation, from Greek into Latin, and from the Latin again into the Greek. Indeed this incident of the Council of Chalcedon does but strengthen our argument; for we now may add that the Greeks themselves admitted that the canon of Nicaea acknowledged the supremacy of the Pope. The question then before the Fathers was whether Constantinople should have a Patriarchate. The Pope's legate maintained that the Nicene Canon forbade any change to be made in the relative standing of the churches. The clergy of Constantinople adduced the III^d Canon of the Second Council, which conceded to their master the post of honor next after the Bishop of Rome. "After the debate," Dr. Schaff tells us, "the imperial commissioners thus summed up the result: From the whole discussion, and from what has been brought forward on either side, we acknowledge that the primacy over all (*πρὸ πάντων τὰ πρωτεία*), and the most eminent rank (*καὶ τὴν ἐξαιρητικὸν τιμὴν*) are to continue with the Archbishop of old Rome; but that also the Archbishop of New Rome should enjoy the same precedence of honor (*τα πρεσβεῖα τῆς τιμῆς*)." I should be happy to see Dr. Schaff make good his point against Hefelé, as it would add new strength to my statement that the ancients understood this sixth Nicene canon to be a clear acknowledgment of the primacy of the Apostolic See.

V. These five arguments—drawn respectively from the grammatical structure of the sentence, from the logical sequence of ideas, from Catholic analogy, from comparison with the process of formation of the Byzantine Patriarchate, and from the authority of the ancients—seem to me an overwhelmingly abundant confirmation of our understanding of the canon before us. True, a very formidable array of mighty names can be marshalled against us; but the number of these will be decimated by considering how few of the eminent authors who have interpreted the canon in a different sense from ours had consulted the original text. We are not inquiring in this paper whether our interpretation be the most obvious one on the basis of the Dionysian version. We started out with asserting the right of investigating the document for ourselves, which, surely, is the most direct method of ascertaining the truth. With Dionysius we are not concerned. His version may

have represented to himself the idea which we have extracted from the Greek; in fact, Bellarmine and Baronius have interpreted his translation as we have interpreted the original. But, as was stated at the outset, not every translator who has seized the true sense of his text embodies that sense clearly in the words he selects. This has probably been the misfortune of Dionysius in the present instance.

As an appendix to our discussion, I beg leave to suggest to those who still cling to the idea that in the clause, "Since this is also the Roman Bishop's custom," the Council meant, "Since it is also the Roman Bishop's custom to be a Patriarch," that there is a grave difficulty inherent in this interpretation. To be frank, I do not believe that, in the age of the Nicene Council, the Pope was a Patriarch. When was his patriarchate founded? What were its boundaries? What special prerogatives did the Pope claim or exercise in virtue of this adventitious dignity? The chief office of the ancient patriarchs was to ordain, judge, and depose bishops and metropolitans, and to convoke and preside over synods. The Bishop of Alexandria had been, from time immemorial, every inch a patriarch throughout his vast domain. The Bishop of Antioch enjoyed a similar authority throughout the great diocese of Oriens. Their jurisdiction was *immediate* and *ordinary*, and there is no difficulty in defining its nature and the limits within which it was exercised. If, therefore, the Council had "illustrated the sort of power," which it accorded to the Bishop of Alexandria, "by referring to a similar power exercised by the" Bishop of Antioch, then the term of comparison would be clearly intelligible; because both were patriarchs, with pretty much the same sort of power and the same extent of territory. But who has ever defined satisfactorily the limits and nature of Rome's patriarchal sway? Protestant writers have circumscribed this "Roman Patriarchate," some within the radius of a hundred miles, others within the confines of the urban vicariate.¹ Catholic writers are more generous, and make the "Patriarch of Rome" a donation of the entire Western World. But, on both sides, there is difficulty; for the Protestants have to explain how it is we find the Pope exercising great authority beyond the boundaries in which they have hemmed him; whilst the Catholics have to explain how it is that the Roman Pontiffs are not found to have ordained Bishops in Milan, or presided over synods in Carthage. In both cases the patriarchal robes they have made for the Pope do not fit him; the first is entirely too small, the second too large. And as neither party will abandon its unproved assumption, that the Pope was, in the technical sense of the

¹ Southern and Central Italy and the adjacent islands.

word, a patriarch, the Protestants have to fall back upon the easy doctrine of Papal aggression, and the Catholic controversialists are obliged to contend that "the Pope had authority over the whole West, but did not exercise it equally in all places." Surely the Pope had authority over East and West, as Head of the Church; but when we ask what particular part of the Church he exercised that authority, in immediately performing in person the routine work, it will not do to make distinctions between the having, and the exercising, of authority. The Egyptian Bishops at Chalcedon protested that "nothing could be done by a Bishop of their country without the consent of the Patriarch of Alexandria." Can anything similar to this be said of the early Western Church? Not by any means. The various provinces of Europe and Africa were governed by their bishops and metropolitans, and whenever the Pope stepped in it was as the successor of St. Peter, "to whom the care of the whole vineyard had been intrusted." The notion, then, that the Bishops of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, like Jupiter and his two brothers, had divided the world among them, was not conceived at that early day, but was the offspring of schismatical brains in Constantinople. The Patriarchates did not enter into the original constitution of the Church, which existed before them, and has survived them. That interpretation of our canon, therefore, which is adopted generally by Protestants and admitted by several Catholic writers, is founded in error. The Council cannot have illustrated the powers confirmed to the Patriarch of Alexandria by referring to a similar exercise of power by the "Roman Patriarch," because this latter personage had no existence. Whatever powers the Bishop of Rome exercised beyond the narrow boundaries of his little province—which certainly did not constitute a patriarchate—he exercised in virtue of his "primacy over all." It ought not to be overlooked, moreover, that the Popes intervened more frequently in the East than they did in the West, because in that turbulent quarter of the globe it more frequently happened that knots were to be cut worthy of the Vicar of Christ. But whenever the emergency called for Papal intervention, the Roman Pontiffs did not pause to consider in what patriarchate their authority was needed. A fuller elucidation of this point is foreign to our present purpose.

I hope that my readers will not consider that my investigation of this subject has been excessively minute. Should they be inclined to think so, let them take up any of the heterodox historians who have treated of Papal supremacy, and see how prominently this Nicene Canon figures in their pet theory of the gradual aggrandizement of the Bishop of Rome. To that theory it is essential to assume that at the epoch of the Council of Nicaea the au-

thority of the Roman Pontiff was circumscribed by very narrow limits. Unless Protestants make good this assertion, no force of rhetoric can avail to establish their system.

Never mind, then, their voluminous rhetoric; shake this one column and their oratorical edifice will tumble upon their heads. When the Bishop of Rome first met the assembled Universal Church, was he considered a "Bishop like any other?" Was he a metropolitan "enjoined to take care of suburban churches?" or a patriarch with "proper limits assigned" him by an unsuspecting council? If I have been even moderately successful in my efforts, I have demonstrated that the Vicar of Christ at his first emerging from the gloomy atmosphere of the Catacombs into the free open sunlight, had already attained the full measure of his greatness.



THE LAWS OF THE CHURCH WITH REGARD TO SECRET SOCIETIES.

WHAT laws has the Church enacted against secret societies? Why does she inflict so severe penalties on their members? What societies incur her condemnation? These are the questions which it is proposed briefly to answer in this article, guided by the best authorities on the subject.

I.

First, then, *what laws has the Church enacted against secret societies?* As far back as 1738 Pope Clement XII. excommunicated the Freemasons: this excommunication was renewed in 1751 by Benedict XIV., in 1821 by Pius VII., and in 1826 by Leo XII. But the weightiest authority on the subject is the Papal Constitution "*Apostolicæ Sedis*," promulgated by His Holiness Pius IX. on October 12th, A.D. 1869. By this most important document the Supreme Pontiff, just when the Vatican Council began its labors, proclaimed to the Catholic world the censures, "*latae sententiæ*," which were to remain in vigor, and the exact limits assigned to each, while he abolished by the same Constitution all former censures not therein renewed. Of the excommunications which are there stated as remaining in force, there are four classes. Of the first the absolution is in a *special manner* reserved to the Supreme Pontiff; of the second class, absolution is *usually* reserved to the same; of the third class, it is reserved to the bishops; and of the fourth, absolution is not reserved, but allowed to every ordinary

confessor. Now among those of the second class, *i. e.*, among those usually reserved to the Pope, and therefore considered very weighty, the fourth case regards the present subject. It states that all those are *ipso facto* excommunicated "who become members of the Masonic Lodges or of the Carbonari, or of other societies of the same kind, which openly or secretly plot against the Church or against legitimate powers; and likewise all who in any way show favor to such societies; and all those who do not denounce their secret chiefs or leaders until they shall have denounced them."

The evils, then, which the members of the condemned societies incur, as seen from this last document in particular, may be reduced to three heads.

1. *They render themselves guilty of a grievous mortal sin*, thereby forfeiting their right to heaven, as Esau sold his birthright for a mess of pottage; and this although they should see no evil in said societies, provided they know the prohibition of the Church. For the sin is incurred by disobeying the laws of the Church in a grievous matter. It is the Pope's right and duty to feed the lambs and the sheep of Christ, to lead them into wholesome pastures, and to keep them away from poisonous fields. Whenever the Church through her Supreme Pastor threatens a grievous censure against those who pursue any certain course, she thereby most solemnly forbids that course: to disobey her is to disobey Christ, who has said to her: "He who hears you, hears Me; and he who despiseth you, despiseth Me." And this Pope Leo XII. declared when he said: "Be convinced that no one can be a member of those societies without making himself guilty of a most grievous crime." *Quin gravissimi flagitii reus sit.* When a power constituted by Almighty God decides a point it is not for inferiors to judge whether the decision be right or wrong. What is the use of having a teaching body on earth if every one is to be his own judge after all? This spirit of private judgment is the very principle of Protestantism.

2. *They incur excommunication, i. e.*, over and above the grievous sin of disobedience, the members of the condemned societies incur as a penalty the heaviest censure that the Church can inflict on any one by the power granted her by Christ: "What you shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven." She separates such rebellious children from her communion, and thereby from all participation in the spiritual blessings of which she is the dispenser through the sacred blood of Christ, and through his commission to his Church: "As the Father hath sent Me, I also send you." "And behold, I am with you even to the consummation of the world." The excommunicated Catholic is entirely deprived of all the Sacraments as long as his excommunication lasts; he has no share whatever

in the public prayers and sacrifices which the Church in union with Christ is ever offering up for all her children; he is disowned by her and he is no longer her child; she has no blessings for him in life, and if he die in that state she has no Christian burial for him after death; she offers no prayers for the repose of his poor soul. He has knowingly and willingly separated himself from her communion, and he must bear the consequences. Should he have become a member without knowing these consequences, the only way he can avoid these great evils is to withdraw at once from the condemned societies as soon as he becomes aware of these penalties.

3. *This excommunication is usually reserved to the Supreme Pontiff, i. e.,* one who has incurred this excommunication, even when he repents, when he severs all connection with the condemned societies, and humbly applies for absolution, cannot be absolved by an ordinary confessor, but only by the Pope or by one who has been delegated by the Pope for that purpose. We must add, however, that in this missionary country our bishops and priests possess more powers in such matters than in Catholic lands; and that when a sinner is in danger of death any priest in any country can absolve him from all his sins, notwithstanding the excommunication. For the Church is a merciful mother, and does not wish any one to die without hope. Such absolution, however, "by any priest," supposes that no recourse can be had to the Pope or to one delegated by him in this matter; and that the excommunicated person, if he should recover, shall afterwards be duly absolved from his excommunication by one authorized to absolve him from it.

We feel convinced that on none of the points so far stated is there any difference of opinion among the teachers of the Church. A question was raised whether those could be absolved from sin who had become Freemasons, if they repented of having taken the forbidden oath, but still retained an outward semblance of membership. This question was set at rest by an answer from the Holy Office at Rome, which decided that such persons could not be absolved while maintaining this semblance of membership.

II.

We will next consider *the reasons why Holy Church pronounces so severe a sentence against such societies.* Many Catholics care not to ask this question. It is enough for them to learn that the Church has pronounced on any subject; they know that the reasons must be supremely good, since rulers humanly so prudent, and enlightened by a higher wisdom, have so determined. Still there are not wanting motives for examining this point, *v. g.,* that we may be

able to give a clear answer to outsiders, who may ask us why we cannot unite with them in societies which appear to them harmless enough. But there is one motive for examining this matter, to which we desire to call special attention. It is this: by understanding the various reasons why the Church prohibits certain societies we shall be warned against the various dangers connected with them; and we shall understand that if there are some associations which are not directly condemned, these may, however, be full of dangers, as involving or leading to some of the evils which belong to the worst kinds of societies. In examining these reasons we must bear in mind that the Church, in matters of such importance, is guided by considerations of the general and highest good. Her first duty is to look to the good of souls, the next to the temporal peace and happiness of civil society at large. The question is not with her, whether in some places some individuals may make a few dollars by joining a certain society, or thereby leave a small fund for wife and children. Lower advantages must be sacrificed for higher, private for public good. How, then, can she tolerate for a moment societies which are ever trying to thwart her twofold mission of glory to God and peace to men, of the salvation of souls and the highest good of civil society? How can she tolerate those who strive to gain such control over her children as to alienate them from herself, and arm them against the mother that bore them? *Her first reason* then is, that she has learned for certain, by long and bitter experience, *the evil purposes of the societies* which she condemns. Many may be ignorant of these purposes, but she is not. She has carefully and thoroughly examined the matter; she has acted with that slowness for which Rome is proverbial. We of course believe her on her word, and besides the proofs of such wicked motives are conspicuous enough to any one that has studied the history of modern European revolutions, even if the Church had not so pronounced. Freemasonry is a powerful association, which boasts to be one and undivided. It is a tree whose branches extend into all Christian lands, and which combines everywhere all the powers that are arraigned against the Catholic Church. There was a time when its aims were more hidden, and there are lands now where all evil purposes are disavowed by most of its members, many of whom are no doubt upright men. But the Church well knows, and every careful reader of history readily sees, that the great war of opposition to Catholicity, and even to Christian civilization, which has been growing more and more fierce and general during the last generation, has constantly been promoted, if not originated, by the action of the Masonic lodges, the Carbonari, and other secret societies of like purposes and similar organization. Every one knows what the Carbonari and Freemasons have done

in Italy within our own lifetime. They have stripped the Holy Father of all his temporal dominions, they have imprisoned him in his palace, they have forced the clergy to enter the army, they have striven to make vocations to the priesthood impossible by preventing young men from entering the seminaries and as novitiates of religious bodies, they have closed many religious houses and expelled the inmates, they have desecrated churches and stolen the ecclesiastical revenues.

In Germany the war has been bitter unto imprisonment and death in chains, but its worst feature has been the expulsion of religious teachers from the land, and the handing over of the children to irreligious and infidel educators. What had the poor Sisters of Charity done to deserve this treatment? Evidently the blow was not aimed at them, but at the Catholic Church, of which they embody the spirit. Even a law against religious as such would have been too unpopular with the masses, therefore the leaders of the secret plot called it a law against the Jesuits and kindred bodies, and as the Jesuits are the universal scapegoats the ruse was successful.

In France the war just now is as fierce as possible; all the evils that have been brought on Germany and Italy are there aimed at, and the Freemasons come boldly and openly to the front in the army of irreligion, hatred of the Church and of God. They have long acted more fearlessly in France than in other lands. During the terrible reign of the Commune in Paris the Freemasons as such openly planted their banners on the walls of Paris for the avowed protection, not of France against Prussia, but of Communism against the party of order. On May 2d, 1871, between three thousand and four thousand Freemasons met in the Place de la Concorde, and resolved that "the banners of the brotherhood should remain on the ramparts, and that the Masons should march with the National Guards to their respective quarters for the protection of the Commune." This was the work, it must be noticed, of the Central Lodge of France, not of some obscure branch of the Masonic body. On May 3d the dispatches announced from Dieppe: "The Freemasons here, in conjunction with those of Rouen, have voted their full adhesion to the address of the Central Lodge in Paris." The Freemasons are in power now; they have recalled the Communists from exile, those same men who had promoted the abominations of the Commune, the burning of Paris, and the shooting of its noble bishop, with those of his clergy, and irreproachable laymen, who had the happiness of sharing his martyrdom. And should the Church allow her children to fight under the standard of Freemasonry, and glory in the name, and wear the insignia of the troops marshalled in so many lands against her? And can she

stand by listlessly, when she hears the leaders of those sects lay down a new gospel for their followers in direct opposition to the Gospel of Jesus Christ? Listen to some of its teachings: here is a resolution of the Masonic Council of Naples some ten years ago: "Considering that the idea of *God* is the source and support of all despotism and of all iniquity, the freethinkers of Paris pledge themselves to the prompt and radical abolition of Catholicity, and by every means to procure its utter destruction." The Freemasons of other lands were represented in that general council. F. Lafargue, at the Council of Liege, in Belgium, uttered this war-cry: "War against God, this is progress!" F. Jules Ferry, the present Minister of Public Instruction in France, describes Catholicity as "the grand army of human folly."

In England and the United States most Masons would of course disown such sentiments; we do not question their honesty, but the Church has seen enough of the fruits of Masonry to judge the whole tree and to guard her children against it. Placed here by her Divine Founder to direct the consciences of His followers, she points out the forbidden tree, and says, "On the day you will eat of it you shall die the death" of the soul, losing the life of grace. If the tree here had never borne evil fruit, the presumption would still be against it; for the very name and the identity of organization would suggest further identity. But have not the lodges here inserted in their reports the achievements of their brother Masons in other lands, even those of a very unchristian character, as triumphs of their sect? We know they have; and we could prove it, if it were at all seriously questioned, whether the Masonic lodges here, as a rule, sympathize with the Masonic lodges throughout the world, and even explicitly fraternize with them. Besides, must we believe them on their word when they speak of their harmless intentions? Are they not bound to secrecy? If they had evil intentions would they tell us of them? Still we will grant that there are among them here and in England men so honest that if they knew their own lodges aimed to destroy Christianity they would at once withdraw from them. Whether they would be so determined if only Catholicity were plotted against we do not know. But this is not the question. The lodges here are found in company with those who aim at great evil; they are like men caught in the company of conspirators; the presumption is unfavorable, and they must clear themselves. As long as they do not, they cannot claim that the Church should make an exception in their favor. But is not the spirit of Masonry one throughout the world? But a few weeks ago a prominent Mason and Orientalist wrote: "Western Masonry borrowed from the Arabic its spirit and form, changing only what was necessary to localize the

institution in Christian countries. Some parts of the system have been entirely Christianized, to the very great damage of Masonry. The two systems are not parallel nor harmonious. They rest on very different bases in the hearts and minds of men, and as the Christian system is introduced true Masonry is excluded. The Masonic institution is altogether different from that sacerdotal society of the Nile, whose supreme ideal was a theological God, in that the supreme ideal of Masonry is *humanity*."—*Brooklyn Cath. Rev.*, Feb. 7th, 1880.

The second reason why the Church condemns all such societies is in the *oath of secrecy* which their members swear. This oath may assume various forms, but it will generally be liable to one or all of the following objections: (*a.*) It is wrong to promise, whether under oath or not, to do things which are not yet known, as when one is made to swear that he will execute orders of which he does not yet know the nature; and it is of course worse still to promise it under oath. This requires no proof; and, therefore, though an important objection to the oaths of some secret societies, it will not be further developed by us. It is no answer to say that religious promise obedience, for they know the nature of what shall be required of them; whereas the secret societies professedly withhold their secrets till after the oath.

(*b.*) It is never allowed to promise entire secrecy, *i. e.*, to pledge oneself to keep anything secret from those who have authority to require the revelation. Now the oath of most secret societies binds the members to such absolute secrecy. Hence Lord Plunket says: "I consider an association bound by a secret oath to be extremely dangerous on the principles of common law; inasmuch as they subtract from the state, and interpose between him and his allegiance to the king." For *king* substitute *sovereign power*, and the same reason holds for all countries, be they republican or otherwise. The Catholic has besides conscientious obligations of subjection to his Church, whether in the confessional or before his priest or bishop; and he cannot promise to hide what it may become his duty to make known. The following is the oath of Masonry, as copied from the manual of the English lodges, and it is certainly liable to this objection and to several others. The candidate kneels, and placing his right hand on the Old Testament, and with his left supporting one point of the compasses to his naked breast, he says in presence of the Worshipful Master:

"I, N. or M., in the presence of the Great Architect of the Universe, . . . do hereby and hereon most solemnly and sincerely swear that I will always hale (*sic*), conceal, and never reveal any part or parts, point or points, of the secrets and mysteries of or belonging to Masons; what have been, shall now, or may here-

after be communicated to me, . . . on no less a penalty, on the violation of any of them, than to have my throat cut across, my tongue torn out by the root. . . . So help me God!"

No man can take that oath without refusing the Church and the civil government what either may have a right to learn, *v. g.*, when he is summoned as a witness before a lawful tribunal, sacred or profane. Besides, pray, gentlemen of the fraternity, who is to cut the throat across? Where does reason or revelation teach that God will do it? Does not the appointing of a special penalty imply an intention to inflict it? There are many rumors afloat and some stubborn facts, *v. g.*, the murder of Mr. Morgan, in the State of New York, which assign terrible vindictiveness to the lodges against all violators of the terrible oath. The words quoted seem to bear such a meaning. If not, what *do* they mean? But of course you cannot tell us, it is part of the sworn secret, and you do not want to have your throats cut across. Perhaps you say the whole oath is a mockery. We have no doubt that with very many persons it is a mere mockery; but that too is wrong.

(*c.*) This is a *third objection* to such oaths: no one can lawfully take an oath in jest, nor for a trifle. "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain." Is the dreadful oath we have just quoted but a mockery, a play? If it is, it looks like the play of a lower world. And is the Prince of Wales, *v. g.*, the future head of the English Church, the present Grand Master of the Masons in England, to lead in such sacrilegious profanation? It is often said, and it appears to us the most plausible explanation, that such men as the Prince of Wales are but figure-heads to give outward respectability to the "brotherhood," that they are not acquainted with any bad designs, but know of only philanthropy and display; that many other good men are received to get money and influence through them, while they see nothing in Masonry but self-interest or amusement, or even a sort of respectable worship.

(*d.*) There is a strong presumption that a secret oath will hide some mischief or other. Truth and honesty love the light; falsehood and crime seek darkness. If all the aims and all the means are noble and pure, especially in a free country as ours is, what need is there of secrecy? Is it to create a monopoly, and to give occupation only to members of cliques and parties? If so, these societies are the bane of free and fair competition, and the sworn enemies of the man who depends on his honest labor. Is a man in a free country to be excluded from a position because his conscience does not allow him to join certain associations?

The third reason, which makes the Catholic Church condemn all such societies, is one which applies in a special manner to these

United States, though it extends through the world, as it is the *life and soul* of Masonry in particular. It is namely, the spirit of *indifferentism*, and as such *opposition to all dogmatic Christianity*. Humanitarianism is extolled, and any definite religious teaching is thrust into the background. Christ has said: "Go and baptize all nations, *teaching them* to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." "He who believes and is baptized shall be saved; but he who believeth not shall be condemned." And St. Paul said: "If an angel from heaven should preach another gospel, let him be anathema." Masonry not only labors persistently here as elsewhere to pull down all difference of belief among Christian sects; but it puts Mohammedanism and Buddhism and all *isms* exactly on the same level with Christianity. It extols humanitarianism, for it must hold up some *idol*, but it does not rest the love of man on the love of God; the earthly good of man is the *summum bonum*, and regard for God is a means to that end, where it is respected at all. Thus the "Official Proceedings of the M. W. Grand Lodge of Missouri, for 1877," says, on p. 89, that Masonry requires belief in God "and it does so on the ground that to one who has no belief in God conscience is an idle term, having no fixed standard, and no boundary but such as the individual himself may fix." This is *the* reason why it favors belief in God, at least in the United States, and condemns the action of the Masonic body in France, which wishes to strike out belief in God from its Constitution. But besides this belief in God and consequently in the immortality of the soul, as means to obtain the *summum bonum*, the exaltation of human nature here below, Freemasonry favors and inculcates the broadest indifferentism. There are various ways of inculcating indifferentism. The Missouri report, lately referred to, quotes, on page 88, the following words of the first English Masonic constitution, which words, it says, are still regarded as the first principles of the craft.

"Though in ancient times Masons were charged in every country to be of the religion of that country or nation, *whatever it was*, yet it is now thought more expedient only to obtain that religion in which all men agree, leaving their particular opinions to themselves."

This is the indifferentism which is the *first principle of the craft*, and which the Church must condemn, and every one that believes in dogmatic Christianity must do the same. This principle the Masons carry into universal practice. Hence they everywhere favor, and in many lands have evidently brought about, the total severance of religion and education, in Italy, Germany, Belgium, etc., and now they are trying to do the same in France, not accidentally, but in virtue of their spirit, which everywhere is in direct

antagonism to the Catholic Church. Therefore the Church considers them as working essentially, by their very nature, against herself, and wherever the state has sided with the Church, against the state. Hence the late contests in Italy, etc., so professedly Masonic.

It will be noticed that we have applied most of our objections to the Freemasons, as being outwardly the most respectable and the most widely spread, and as being the first who provoked the condemnation of the Church; but the evils complained of exist in most other secret societies in a large measure, in particular this worship of humanity, this latent pantheism, which makes earthly happiness the *summum bonum*, and humanity its God. Of course the Church loves mankind, and labors for its true happiness, viz., eternal union with Christ, who died for man; but indifferentism or humanitarianism severs man from Christ and from all supernatural aspirations. The Church and indifferentism are the two armies of Christ and Antichrist. The Protestant sects are but pasteboard ramparts scattered here and there along the battlefield. Masonry laughs at them, it never fights against them. But the Vatican is the stronghold it unceasingly attacks, as the great opponent of indifferentism, the only citadel of dogmatic Christianity. Indifferentism calls itself modern progress, and its enemy Jesuitism, clericalism, ultramontanism, all synonyms with true Christianity. Many *civil* reasons might be mentioned why secret societies should be discountenanced, as productive of great temporal evils. Those who wish to study this view of the subject more fully will do well to read *Adams's Letters on Masonry*. But there are two points to which we wish to call attention on this occasion. First. In the United States we have had enough of secret *rings*; we want no more of them; we see already clearly enough that such associations can do much for evil when it becomes their interest to do it. What produced the gigantic fraud of the Credit Mobilier but a secret ring or society?—call it what you will. What was the Whiskey Ring but a secret society on a small scale? Secondly. Have not secret societies often much to do with screening the guilty from justice, and thus multiplying crime at a most fearful rate? Some Freemasons say: We first try a brother in our lodge, and if we find him guilty we abandon him to his fate; if innocent, we shield him. But who has constituted them the judges of the land? This *imperium in imperio* is radically wrong, and directly against the idea of government.

III.

We must lastly consider what societies are condemned by the Church. And here we must distinguish those which are condemned so as to

incur all the penalties spoken of in our first part, and those which do not exactly come under the ban, but still are reprobated by her as evil or dangerous and to be avoided. The *first class* can best be made known by examining the very words of the bull "Apostolicæ Sedis," which we quoted above. Those are therein excommunicated "*who become members of the Masonic lodges (Sectæ Masonicæ), or of the Carbonari, or of other societies of the same kind, which openly or secretly plot against the Church or against legitimate powers; likewise all who in any way show favor to those same societies (favorem qualemcumque præstantes), and all those who do not denounce their secret chiefs or leaders, till they have denounced them.*"

Therefore, 1st. *All Freemasons* are excommunicated, no matter in what land they live, or to what lodge they belong; even though they may not be aware of any evil in the body which they have joined. The standard of Masonry is planted over the camp of opposition to the Church. No man can fight under two opposing standards, as "no man can serve two masters," God and Belial. It is supposed, however, that the members know the law of the Church, and the penalty or censure attached to its violation.

2d. The *Carbonari* are also explicitly condemned; they are but a particular form of Masonry.

3d. *All members of other societies of the same kind (ejusdem generis).* The Church does not give us their names explicitly, but they are to be known by their being of the same kind as the societies named. Now societies are specified by their object, *i. e.*, by the work they are instituted to perform. Thus, a society is a religious, a benevolent, a temperance society, as its object or work is to practice religion, benevolence, temperance. And what *kind* is to be so understood in this case the bull clearly enough indicates by the words following: "*Which openly or secretly plots against the Church or against legitimate powers.*" In fact, this plotting constitutes the *essence* of the societies excommunicated in this definitive sentence. The oath of secrecy is not essential; *openly or secretly*, says the document. This reasoning of ours is put beyond all question by an order issued by Pius IX., in 1865, to the Cardinal prefect of the Propaganda, instructing him to call the attention of some of the bishops in the United States to a decree of the Roman tribunal of the Inquisition, issued in 1846, which says: "*The secret societies, of which there is question in the Pontifical Constitutions, are understood to be all those which aim at anything against the Church, or against the government, whether they require from their members an oath to keep a secret or not.*"

But it is not necessary that the societies openly acknowledge their illicit aim; it is enough that the aim exists to incur the excommunication, even though the members protest that such aim

is quite foreign to their intention. Thus, the Acts of the last Plenary Council of Baltimore, held in 1866, contain this statement, viz., that when, in 1850, the Archbishop of Philadelphia, Most Rev. F. P. Kenrick, consulted the Holy See about Odd Fellows, Sons of Temperance, and other societies of the kind, proposing the doubt in these words: "Whether those societies are to be held as forbidden which profess that they do not plot against religion or the civil state, though they enter into a secret league confirmed by oath, or otherwise bind themselves to secrecy?" The Sacred Congregation answered that "*these were comprehended under the Pontifical bull.*"—Conc. Plen., Balt., Acta et Dec., p. 261.

To apply these laws of the Church to individual societies would be as long a task as it would be thankless, nor is it our business. We have simply endeavored to lay down connectedly the laws enacted upon the subject by those to whom the government of the Church has been intrusted by Christ our Lord. In fact, this matter is so delicate that Rome has reserved the decision of doubtful cases to itself, for it has decreed that if any case of considerable doubt should arise, *that case should be referred to the Roman tribunals*, as is done in all matters of very great importance. In compliance with this the case of the Fenians was, in 1870, referred to the supreme tribunal of Rome, which, after very careful examination of the whole subject, definitely pronounced that the society of the Fenians came under the excommunication of the Church. (Ballerini, v. ii., p. 998, in nota.) Of course we would all like to see dear old Catholic Ireland get her full rights of civil and religious freedom, and all the blessings which her devoted sons so richly deserve, but "*we must do no evil that good may come of it*," the end, with Catholics, does not justify the means, whatever Protestants may think of Catholic laxity of doctrine. The crown of Ireland is bright with the jewels of martyrdom; with Christ, she is like the lamb before its shearer; with him, thorns and stripes are her portion on earth; but with him, too, she will be glorified in heaven; even on earth a glorious resurrection may be destined for her; but impatience and imprudence will not hasten its dawn, nor blunt one thorn of her bloody crown, as experience has shown.

4th. *All such are excommunicated as favor in any way the excommunicated societies.*

5th. *All those who do not denounce their secret chiefs or leaders till they have denounced them.* Only secret leaders are spoken of, and none need denounce when it would probably be of no use, do no good at all, as theologians teach.

Lastly, it remains for us to speak of those societies which are evil or dangerous, and of course condemned by the Church, though not threatened with the same penalties. These may, in general,

be known by the fact that they contain one or more of the evils or dangers stated in our second part as reasons why the Church condemned the worst kind of societies. For these reasons are not of our own invention. Almost all, if not all, are laid down in the Apostolic Constitution of Benedict XIV., "*Providas.*" The most evident evil is the fostering of indifference, and the most ordinary sign of evil is the obligation to secrecy, especially when confirmed by an oath. But on this delicate subject we prefer to say little ourselves, and to let our bishops speak, who share, with the Supreme Pontiff, the government of the Church by Divine commission. After saying that certain societies do not fall under the prohibition of the Church, our bishops of the United States, assembled at Baltimore, in 1866, add this caution: "Care should be taken lest under this pretext (they speak of mutual protection of workingmen) anything be allowed which favors the condemned societies; and lest the laboring men who join such societies be induced by the wiles of evil and deceitful men unjustly to withhold the labor which is due, or in any other way to violate the rights of those who are over them. Still we do not wish all this to be so understood as if those societies should be considered as tolerated in which, no matter what be their nature, the members on first entering them bind themselves by oath to obey commands which may happen to be issued by the chiefs of the association, or enter into a bond of secrecy which they cannot safely violate, even when interrogated by lawful authority. Those associations are likewise altogether unlawful whose members are so closely united for mutual defence that danger may thence arise of mobs or bloodshed."

We add this serious warning of Most Reverend Archbishop Hughes, of New York, who so fully knew his people, and was so deeply loved and venerated by them, and even by those not of the Church. In a pastoral address to his diocese, issued in 1842, he writes thus: "Now we warn and admonish all the faithful committed to our charge, if any are involved in such associations, to withdraw from them with as little delay as possible; and also, as a rule of safety and precaution, we entreat all others not to yoke themselves in the membership of such associations, *without having first asked leave of their respective pastors or clergymen* whether they can do so without cutting themselves off from the communion of the Church."

We conclude with these earnest words from the same pastoral letter: "If they (Catholics) wish to perform charities, the rules of religion direct the manner, and their fellow-members and neighbors furnish perpetual occasion for its exercise. But wherever some partial good is set forth as the end and aim of any separate society, unless all its duties be public and left free, the faithful

ought to be on their guard, lest there be connected with it something which is not made public, but by virtue of which they who enter become implicated in snares that may prove fatal to their salvation."

AMERICAN RATIONALISM.

The Holy Ghost, Lord and Giver of Life. A Sermon. By O. B. Frothingham. Published by D. G. Francis, New York.

Proceedings at a Reception in Honor of the Rev. O. B. Frothingham, given by the Independent Liberal Church in New York. Published by G. P. Putnam's Sons, 182 Fifth Avenue, New York.

Farewell Sermon of the same. Delivered April 27th, 1879. Published by the same.

Mistakes of Moses. By Robert Ingersoll. Published in Chicago by Rhodes & McClure.

Ingersoll's Lectures on Skulls, Ghosts, Hell, and Robert Burns.

Dr. Felix Adler's Sermons, as published in the New York papers.

Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion. By F. Max Müller, M. A. Published by Charles Scribner's Sons.

THIS last work is not properly an American work; but as it is one of the chief fountains from which our American rationalists draw their supplies, the Catholic critic should read it in order to understand fully the drift of the teaching of Ingersoll, Adler, and Frothingham. There are unquestionably more rationalists in America than these, but few living are of greater prominence. Mr. Ingersoll is decidedly the most pugnacious and aggressive of the three. He has a wonderful power of sarcasm, and is skilful in handling the sharpest weapon of the ancient scoffers,—ridicule. Voltaire is his master, Luther his model in style. One of the most bitter, contemptuous, and overwhelmingly destructive onslaughts ever made on the gloomy system of Calvinism occurs in his lecture on Robert Burns. Imagine an audience of grim-visaged Scotch Presbyterians listening to it. We saw such a one once, fairly wilting under his withering irony and eloquent denunciations. It is to be regretted that Mr. Ingersoll does not confine his contempt to the horrible doctrine of fore-ordained damnation, so revolting to human reason and to the nature of the beneficent Deity, but that he extends it to the whole of Christianity.

Mr. Adler is a young preacher, of Hebrew origin, who gives

ethical lectures in a hall in New York, and hates a dogma as a bull does a red rag. He discards the literalism of the orthodox Hebrews, and believes only in natural morality. He does, however, most undoubtedly believe in himself, in his talents, and his future. A short conversation with him will convince any one of that.

Rev. Mr. Frothingham is the Melancthon of American rationalism. He is sweet-tempered, not sarcastical. He is poetical and moderate. He is laudatory, not vituperative like Mr. Ingersoll, and although he may not be more gifted than Dr. Adler, still his words will always carry greater weight, owing to his mildness and modesty. Indeed, Dr. Frothingham has quite a respectable following in New York, and some Catholic gentlemen who know him, and who from motives of curiosity have attended some of his lectures, express themselves as much pleased with his tone and manner, especially in treating Catholic subjects. In what we are about to write we shall, therefore, dwell principally upon American Rationalism as represented in the teachings of Mr. Frothingham, because they contain all that may be found in Ingersoll's lectures and Adler's sermons. The rostrum or the pulpit is the proper place for an answer to these, where their own weapons would find a legitimate sphere. But in the columns of a calm *Review*, cool reason is the proper weapon with which to fight the self-possessed Corypheus of American rationalism.

That Mr. Frothingham has a numerous and respectable following is proved by the names of those who were present when he gave his farewell sermon last April in the Union League theatre in this city. We find that upon that occasion rationalistic addresses were made by the Hon. Frank Fuller, George Hanar Putnam, George William Curtis, Dr. Felix Adler, the Rev. John W. Chadwick, Colonel Thomas W. Higginson, Edmund C. Stedman, the Rev. Samuel Longfellow, the Rev. Joseph May; while congratulatory letters were sent by Ralph Waldo Emerson, William Lloyd Garrison, George Ripley, Oliver Wendell Holmes, the Rev. Charles G. Ames, the Rev. Samuel Johnson, Joseph H. Choate, and the Rev. William J. Potter. Certainly here are numerous and respectable names enough of men distinguished in all the walks of life and letters. And who were in the audience? Can any orthodox preacher in the country point to so distinguished a class of parishioners as those whose names are printed on pages 8 and 9 of the "Proceedings at a Reception in honor of the Rev. O. B. Frothingham?"

Now what is the charm in the doctrines of this rationalistic leader which brings to him the sympathy and co-operation of so distinguished a following? This is the question which naturally presents itself. It will be best answered by a manifestation of

what his teaching is. In order to find this out we proposed a certain number of queries to a Catholic gentleman who had many opportunities of knowing and hearing Mr. Frothingham, and the following were his answers :

1st. "I do not think that he admits of a supernatural order in the sense of theologians. He believes in God, and that is about as much as I ever heard him say about God. He impresses me as not believing in prayer or grace, or other than natural means in aid of human progress and man's happiness."

2d. "He does believe in the freedom of the human will most emphatically. His great argument has been to teach men self-reliance and independence, and the efficacy of their own powers. In other words, he is a Pelagian and not a Calvinist."

3d. "His rule of ethics is not the ten commandments alone, but all that is good, and true, and noble, from whatever source it may come. The leading feature of his teaching has been to insist on the dignity and power of the *individual* man, denying all church authority and all priestly power.

"I don't think Mr. Frothingham can be properly said to have a system. He never assumes the rôle of a master. He prefers that of an eloquent literary gentleman."

If he has any system, it is "the rejection of all creeds and all church authority, so that he stands on human and individual intelligence. In a word, it is the supremacy of the individual instead of the supremacy of the church. He says beautiful things of the church, admires its beautiful symbolism, but considers it all poetry."

This analysis of the doctrine of Mr. Frothingham chimes exactly with his published sayings. Thus we read that on one occasion he said : "It is a great mistake to suppose that the Church of Rome alone represents the idea of ecclesiastical authority. There has been no despot of a spirit more despotic than Luther and Calvin. Had Martin Luther ever dreamed that in the course of time men would come to appeal to him as being the personification of intellectual liberty, he would have burned his books and gone back into the arms of the old Church which he had left."

The by-laws of the Third Congregational Unitarian Church, which were prepared by a committee of which Mr. Frothingham was the most influential member some four years ago, contain the following passage in section 4 : "It is expressly understood that no subscription or assent to any covenant or formula of faith shall be required of any member of this society." The society accepts "neither church nor Scripture as arbitrators of belief," but freely, "judging both by enlightened reason, carry their appeal to knowledge, experience, and the primary laws of the human mind, as

revealed by science and philosophy wisely interpreted." "The two Protestant sacraments, communion and baptism, have from the beginning been omitted, for the reason that they were so closely, habitually, and universally associated with the older faith as to be valueless for practical benefit, and it has never been possible to devise substitutes for them. The ceremony of christening, or the dedication of childhood, as a social rite of poetic significance, is performed by the pastor when requested."

An epitome of this pure rationalism would be, that as every man's house is his own castle, so every man's hat should be his own church steeple. This Ingersoll asserts, this Dr. Adler preaches, and this is the burden of all the speakers' remarks at the reception given to Dr. Frothingham prior to his departure on a European tour. But let us see what he has to say for himself in his own account of "twenty years of an independent ministry," which is printed as an appendix to the "Proceedings," etc.

In this interesting report he tells us that he "had been and was a believer in the spiritual philosophy—was what was in New England called a Transcendentalist," of the school of Theodore Parker. This was twenty years ago. But he had always "found fault with the theology of Unitarianism as being fluctuating, uncertain, and vague." Thus "he found fault with the Unitarian doctrine in respect to the unity of God." Here Mr. Frothingham is not clear, and seems to be a Pantheist. He writes that Unitarianism "had asserted until it was out of breath that God was numerically one and not numerically three; but that God was one, that there was but one spirit ruling, pervading, and regenerating the world,—a spirit of art, of beauty, of intelligence, of heroic will, of aspiration, of progress, had never been apprehended,—but one spirit, omniscient, omnipotent, ever present." Is this a denial of the personality of God? Is it a revival of the old pantheistic error that God is the *spiritus mundi*?

Mr. Frothingham denies the existence of a devil.¹ He denies the Unitarian doctrine that Christ is a deified man, and makes him a mere ordinary sinner.² He maintains man's immunity from original sin.³ Thus cutting loose from even orthodox Unitarianism, if it be not a contradiction in terms to apply that epithet to the system, "for the last ten years and more this ministry has been a purely *independent* ministry, connected with no sect, associated with no denomination, but simply conditioned on fidelity to the principles of free speech and free thought in all questions that concern religion."⁴ He seems to hold that even the unity of the

¹ Proceedings, etc., p. 74.

² Idem, pp. 75, 76.

³ Idem, pp. 76, 77.

⁴ Proceedings, etc., p. 77.

Supreme Being cannot be proved by reason; for he says:¹ "The Unitarianism of a generation ago never voiced itself clearly on this great article of the unity of God. We do not comprehend it now. Science is throwing light upon it; philosophy is helping us to interpret it; the advance of the human mind is unfolding it, and we see its separate bearings. But it is only through imagination; it is only through faith and hope that we can really rest in a doctrine the deepest, the highest, the noblest, the sweetest," etc.²

Those who desire to see a specimen of Mr. Frothingham's best style should read his sermon on "The Holy Ghost, Lord and Giver of Life." In this discourse he takes for text the article of the creed, "I believe in the Holy Ghost," and asserts that He is not a person at all, but merely a poetical personification of air, light, and love. The grace of his poetic style is only equalled by the self-complacent assumption of that which he does not even undertake to prove. The Holy Ghost, according to him, is air, light, and love, and it would be absurd to hold a contrary opinion! Indeed, a distinguishing trait in all these leading rationalists is the absolute disdain with which they treat all the dogmas of orthodoxy. They are treated as if they were beneath the dignity of an investigation, although the fact that men of brains do believe those dogmas should entitle them to some respect. In this regard they are entirely different from the old rationalists, who tried to prove their theories by arguments from reason and authority.

But we are growing prolix in making this exposé of American rationalism. Let us now proceed to show some of its defects.

We certainly agree with the rationalists in their rejection of the horrible Calvinistic doctrine of total depravity. We can readily understand the reaction that set in, in New England, from the days of Channing, Edwards, and Parker, against the old Calvinistic creed and its detestable estimate of human and the divine nature. We can sympathize with Ingersoll's denunciation of it, and pity him and others whom it has made infidels by the very force of mental reaction. No doctrine has done more to make men unbelievers in this country than Calvin's theory of predestination, and if to-day the country is full of spiritual "tramps," who have left the Christian sects and are roaming about with no fixed religious principles, and if the taint of rationalistic unbelief is on the best minds and on the press of the country, Calvinism is chiefly to blame for it. The Catholic Church teaches that the human will is free; that man's nature is not depraved even by the fall, and that no man will be damned save by his own free act. In the assertion of these fundamental doctrines we are one with all true rationalists. The

¹ Proceedings, etc., p. 75.

² Id. p. 75.

Catholic Church teaches that there are natural virtues, and that human reason is capable of knowing by its own force the fundamental truths of God's existence, providence, and the immortality of the human soul. To hold the contrary opinion is to be a heretic.

We further agree with the rationalists,¹ "that Protestantism is at best a bundle of complicated sects." "It is simply a conglomeration of various interpretations of Scripture. It is nothing more than a misrepresented Bible. Protestantism is only three hundred years old. It is a schism, a departure from the old Church, and it owes the savor of its piety, its nobleness, its grandeur, its sincerity, to the ages that lay behind it in the old Church, from which it came. Protestantism has two fatal weaknesses,—all Protestantism, every form of Protestantism,—from that of Calvin to that of Channing and Buckminster. It builds on the Bible. Its foundations are a book. It constructs all its ideas upon a more or less shadowy theory of an inspired letter—a book that for the last hundred years has been open to the assaults of learning, knowledge, criticism, and scholarship, which have riddled it through and through so completely, that we are not sure of the genuineness of a single chapter of it."

"Another fatal weakness of Protestantism is that it is neither of the old nor of the new. The past and future struggle in its bosom, as they have struggled from the beginning. It gave out that it had faith in reason, in free thought, but it stopped. It never practiced reason; it never believed in free thought. It has set up an iron-bound creed, and it has denounced science, and philosophy, and learning, just as vigorously and absolutely as if it had stated all these things and knew what they meant. Tradition and truth, authority and liberty, law and progress, the reign of the idea and the reign of the creed, have lain side by side unreconciled in its mind. These two powers are tearing Protestantism to pieces. They are always struggling together visibly every Sunday."²

This is better said than we could have said it. Mr. Frothingham should have added that he himself and other rationalists are the only true Protestants. Once admit the principle of private judgment in religious matters, and pure INDIVIDUALISM must be the logical consequence. The very charge of uncertainty, wavering, and doubt, which he brings against Protestantism, is found in the answers written to Ingersoll's *Mistakes of Moses* by such eminent Protestants as Professor Swing, Dr. Ryder, Dr. Herford, and Dr. Gibson. They are apologetic, timid, and vacillating. The only writer who answers the arch-rationalist with firmness and logic is the Jewish Rabbi Wise. No Protestant can answer a

¹ Proceedings, etc., p. 83.

² Id. pp. 84, 85.

rationalist unless by falling back on the Catholic Church or the Jewish synagogue.

INDIVIDUALISM is, therefore, the logical outcome of Protestantism, and individualism is pure rationalism. But is Mr. Frothingham content with his own system? He is not. After "twenty years of an independent ministry" what have he and his colleagues done for the amelioration of the human race, for lifting it up and making it more intelligent and moral than Catholic Christianity makes it? "The Society for Ethical Culture in New York establishes and conducts a kindergarten for poor children, institutes a workingman's lyceum, and offers lectures weekly during the winter by able men, who speak to the working people directly, as man speaks to man."¹ We do not like to laugh at an honest and benevolent gentleman. But really is there not something ridiculous in this statement, that after twenty years of an apostleship, instead of founding churches, schools, and orphan asylums, and preaching the Gospel daily to the poor "as man speaks to man," as the Christians have done, and are doing daily, all that the new Messiah and his followers have accomplished is the establishment of a "kindergarten!" Is Mr. Frothingham content with his INDIVIDUALISM? No! After "twenty years" of laboring in its propaganda he writes: "To-day, as it seems to me, the last word of dogmatic individualism is spoken from this place." "We must have intelligent *organization*."² Then why not take the Catholic *organization*, since you have shown that the Protestant one is defective? Why are you discontented with "Individualism?" Because, "when individualism becomes rough, and rude, and contumacious; when vagaries, and whims, and notions calling themselves inspired, and a coarse kind of self-assertion takes possession of the holy place and utter their diatribes in the name of prophecy, then individualism becomes questionable. Then a destructive process begins. Then institutions are assailed in an intemperate spirit. Then the great creeds of the world are assailed by vulgar hands, are pulled down in promiscuous ruins, never to be built up again."³ But what logic is this? What a religion is this? A logic for gentlemen, but not to be applied by *sans-culottes*. Who will prevent your refined individualism from becoming *sans-culottism*? How can that be religious truth which is not of universal application? How can that be an ethical system which will hold good only in the case of fine ladies and gentlemen, but must never be applied by peasants and washerwomen? What is there in the Society for Ethical Culture; what principle of authority to prevent its *individualism* from becoming "rude" and "vulgar?" As I write there lie before me on

¹ Proceedings, p. 65.

² Id. p. 87.

³ Id. 79.

the table three copies of a Parisian weekly print, which practically refute the whole system of this refined *individualism*. They are editions of *La Lanterne de Boquillon*, par A. Humbert. Low, vile, immoral, and communistic publications, yet circulated and read by thousands in civilized France. Yet they are the logical outcome of refined individualism, as it is the logical outcome of Protestantism. Communism, free love, and Mormonism, are the natural children of individualism, and it will not do for these refined gentlemen rationalists to deny the paternity of their own offspring.

The *reductio ad absurdum* is a most powerful argument against the theory of individualism. Let the theory be applied to the poor, to the ignorant, to the dull, and stupid, and wicked, who form the majority of the human race, and how will it work? A system which would make only a few enlightened gentlemen the predestined inheritors of truth and morality, is as bad as Calvinism, which damns the greatest portion of mankind without their fault, and makes the elect a select few without any merits. A creed to be true, to be of God, must be as universal as his paternity, and as he is the loving father of all, in all times and stages of civilization, it must make no exception in its application between learned and unlearned, between genius and natural stupidity. The blockhead and the boor have as much right to the means of salvation as the man of culture, or he who, clothed in purple and fine linen, discusses metaphysics in the hall of the Society of Ethical Culture. Ride at five o'clock in the evening, in these lovely spring days, along the avenues that lead from this region to the Central Park, and you will meet two processions, one a long line of carriages, with well-conditioned horses, carrying the wealth and luxury of the city out for the fresh country air; the other a line of ill-clad laborers, tired after the day's toil, carrying the implements of their work, their spades, shovels, and pickaxes home to their hovels. Stop them on the road and let Mr. Frothingham, Mr. Ingersoll, Dr. Adler, or any other member of the Society of Ethical Culture preach to them. The line of carriages may move home, their inmates finding comfort in the doctrines which at leisure they may discuss over the sparkling champagne and the dessert. But how will the others act if they be converted to the views of the refined orators? Let these laborers but once believe that there is nothing true in Christianity, that each man must be his own church, that the self-sacrificing life of Christ is a myth and He an impostor, that there is no place of future punishment for evil deeds, and what will become of these poor hardworking men? You will turn them into wild beasts. Their pickaxes and spades will become daggers to stab the rich, and the community will become a prey to human savages with unchained passions and unbridled lusts. This is the

logical consequence of individualism. But can a system be good or true which logically leads to disorder and excess?

But let us show the fallacy of rationalism from higher ground. That reason is self-sufficient is an untenable proposition, for whose complete refutation I send the Society of Ethical Culture back to an abler man than Parker, Channing, or Emerson, although he lived in the thirteenth century. I mean the greatest genius of Christianity, Thomas Aquinas. These gentlemen who dabble in metaphysics know not how much they lose by neglecting to read, I shall not say his immortal *Summa Theologica*, but his equally excellent though shorter work the *Summa Contra Gentiles*.¹ They would learn from its perusal not the graces of style which they do not need, but how to reason logically and soundly, which they certainly do need.

How different in method is the inquiry into the perception of the infinite by natural reason in the modern work of Max Müller, and the more ancient composition of the Angelic Doctor. Müller mopes through Sanscrit roots, fetishes, or *gru-grus*, through the Vedas and Upanishads in quest of the infinite. He reminds one of a man following a marsh-light through a fog in which pitfalls abound. He is not certain. His science of language is not yet perfect. He has a number of facts, from which he deduces probable conclusions, but not certainties. "I thought it right to warn you again and again," he writes towards the conclusion of his work, "against supposing that the foundations which we discovered beneath the oldest Indian temples must be the same for all temples erected by human hands. In concluding I must do so once more.

"No doubt the solid rock, the human heart, must be the same everywhere; some of the pillars even, and the ancient vaults may be the same everywhere, wherever there is religion, faith, or worship.

"But beyond this we must not go, at least not for the present." "I hope that the science of religion, which at present is *but a desire and a seed*, will in time become a fulfilment and a plenteous harvest."²

Thus the result of all his erudition, of all his research, is that he is certain of nothing in regard to the origin of religion or the perception of the infinite. Thus the erudite meets the speculative rationalist on the same shaky ground. Max Müller can find no *δ που* star any more than Mr. Frothingham or Archimedes. Reason let loose from the control of the supernatural, like the bird of good omen which flew from the ark, finds no rest for the sole of her foot till she returns to the bosom of the infallible Church.

¹ What Catholic scholar will give us a good English translation of this work?

² The Origin and Growth of Religion, p. 363.

But let us hear St. Thomas: "A wise man," says he, "is one who directs all things to his last end;" but this end is the goad of the intellect, and that is *Truth*. Wisdom, therefore, consists in considering truth and meditating on it!¹ But truth concerning God is twofold. Some things reason knows by its own force, and some things it is unable to know unless it be assisted. We know that God is and that He is one; but we do not know his inner nature. Yet it is quite proper that even things which we know by the natural light of reason should be made articles of our faith for the following reasons:² Because few men take the trouble to investigate truth. Some are prevented by natural stupidity, so that without aid they could not understand even simple things; others are impeded by their business avocations from spending the necessary time in the investigation of truth; while others are prevented by indolence. Much labor is required, and few are willing to give it. We find children unwilling to study a simple catechism, therefore it would not be paternal on the part of God to leave each individual to himself to find out the truth, especially that which concerns his immortal destiny. Therefore unless the knowledge of even simple truths had been made easy for mankind by the teaching of authorized masters, most men would remain in profound ignorance, since the knowledge of God, which makes men especially perfect and good, would be obtained only to a few cultivated rationalists, and by these only after a long period of time and hard study.

Moreover error is continually mixed up in human investigations, on account of the weakness of the human intellect and the intermingling of *phantasms* with our judgments.³ And, therefore, many would remain in doubt concerning those things even which had been truly demonstrated, because they would be ignorant of the force of the demonstration, especially since they would see contrary things taught by so-called philosophers. Besides, sometimes that which is false and not probable is mixed up with many things that are true and that have been properly demonstrated, the error depending upon some probable or sophistical reason which passes frequently for a demonstration.

Divine clemency has therefore wisely provided that, in order to give us absolute certainty and make the paths of truth easy for us, many truths of reason should at the same time become articles of faith. St. Paul taught this truth before St. Thomas, when he wrote: "This, then, I say and testify in the Lord, that henceforth

¹ Summa Contra Gentiles, caput i. passim.

² Id. caput i., ii., iii., and iv.

³ Id. caput iv.

ye walk not as also the Gentiles walk in the vanity of their mind, having the understanding obscured with darkness."¹

As we are not giving a mere school refutation of rationalism or individualism, the reader will not expect us to give him a long paraphrase of the Angelic Doctor's masterly arguments on the subject. If it is necessary for the great majority of mankind that even simple truths should be revealed to them by teaching, and that after such revelation many of them still remain hopelessly ignorant, it must follow *a fortiori* that revelation is necessary in the case of the more sublime and abstruse truths, some of which, as we know by experience, are above the natural grasp of even such minds as that of Plato and Socrates in the past, and transcend the genius of discordant American transcendentalists in the present. A rationalist who must admit that he never saw a substance, and that he does not understand its nature; that he cannot comprehend the relation between cause and effect; between the laying of the egg and the hatching of the bird; the planting of the seed and the uprising of the stalk, or the action of his own will upon the nerves and muscles of his body, should learn to be humble in the investigation of higher truths and higher forms of being and of life, such as the mysteries of the Trinity and Incarnation, and the sacramental system of the Christian Church. *Scrutator majestatis apprimetur gloria.*

Rem acu tetigisti. The lesson of humility, and there is such a thing as even natural humility, is what rationalists need to learn. The refutation of their system from the moral standpoint is most striking. If they were but honest they would admit that there is nothing in their system of the all-sufficiency of human reason, that will make the individual curb his evil passions; and that in their own case the system of natural ethics is an ethical failure. That they may not be public rogues or malefactors we are willing to admit. Few men are, even among the fetish worshippers of Africa. But are there no vices but these atrocious ones? Let us take up the "Examination of Conscience" as we find it in any Catholic prayer-book, and ask the respectable gentlemen who form the *clientèle* of Dr. Frothingham to study the list of sins in it. We pass by, through courtesy, the grosser offences and sins of act. But how is it with regard to all those internal imperfections of the mind, sins of envy, jealousy, vanity, rash judgment; interior sins against charity and purity? Will reason alone suffice to conquer them? What remedy will the "Society for Ethical Culture," with its "kindergarten," apply to them? It tells us to be respectable and refined; to be gentlemen of culture, to admire works of art and the beauties of nature; to be good, honest, honorable and truthful; but

¹ Ephes., iv. 17.

what means does it give us to enable us to be all that it desires? None but nature and reason. But experience, the honest experience of every man, shows that they are not sufficient, and experience is more powerful than all the syllogisms of the school in this case. Do these gentlemen rationalists expect us to make an act of faith in their sanctity while the hermits, anchorites, confessors, and martyrs of the Catholic Church, who had besides the advantages of nature all the auxiliaries of grace, who did violence to their appetites, and who practiced every species of mortification, attest that they found it wellnigh impossible to conquer their passions? The Society of Ethical Culture may preach morality, but experience, the best teacher, shows that in the end its morality will be Spartan, its only crime discovery. The most intellectual rationalism by the Darwinian theory of evolution will not terminate in a holy asceticism, but degenerate into individual *sans culottism*.

ANGLICAN DEVELOPMENT.

THERE is a plentiful supply of Protestant sects in the United States, but there is little of what in England is called Ritualism. The explanation is easy to be given. There is not in America,—what there is in England,—the development of an ecclesiastical system, which, while possessing many of the watchwords of Catholicity, has but little of its spirit or its life. English Churchism, which has been on trial for three centuries, must be said to have reached its final stage; and, having reached it, is now necessarily on the wane, and must gradually become extinct or broken up. Ritualism was the last forlorn hope—the attempt to build up a national “catholic” church out of the wreck of three centuries of Protestantism. “Puseyism” had suggested the necessity of Catholicity, in the sense of a real priesthood and real dogma; but it did not dare, from its sheer novelty, to introduce the outward robe of magnificent ritual or expression. Ritualism, being developed out of Puseyism, has gained courage or a wild desperation; and, putting on the robe, has appeared before Englishmen in the full dress, Catholic toilet of the Church. After ten years of trial it has proved itself a sham, and is now regarded simply as a sect. Unable to catch the intellect of reasoning men, it has caught only the enthusiasm of the “æsthetic;” but sound thinkers reject it as sheer Protestantism *plus* pretension—a mock church, without authority,

without law. Had it been content with pretty services, pretty vestments, it might have ranked among the phases of Anglicanism; but professing to discard Protestantism, while not possessing Catholic powers, it has come to the ground "between two stools." Earnestness it still has, much industry, frequent services; but since no bishop professes it, and no synod supports it, the whole country regards it as a failure.

At the first it was the policy, the natural instinct of the Ritualists to unite themselves in profession with real Catholics, to affirm that they desired Catholic unity, and were prepared to make sacrifices to obtain it. Real Catholics were spoken of with fraternal affection; the Ritualist newspapers praised "Rome;" even the Pope was profoundly venerated as the head of the Western Church, or perhaps as the First Bishop in Christendom. All this has been changed. When it was found that "coquetting" with the Catholic Church produced no sympathetic concessions, but rather led the Holy See to state frankly and unreservedly the impossibility of yielding one point, the Ritualists, so to speak, lost their temper; they veered round to a policy of independence; and they commenced to disesteem, even to revile that authority, of which hitherto they had spoken with deep love. They would henceforth have a church of their own. "Rome" became an enemy, and was "heretical." Rome was both corrupt and tyrannical. The old-fashioned Protestantism broke out in the new Ritualism, and the Ritualists were henceforth rank Protestants. Nay, it would not be too much to say that in no Anglican sect is there such deliberate Protestantism as among the Ritualists. The solution of the anomaly is quite obvious. The Ritualists have "thought out the whole thing;" they have experimented on fictitious theories of Catholicity; they have played at priesthood, and dogma, and even authority; and having lived in two atmospheres, so far as theories are concerned, they have conceived a Protestantism which is not a sentiment but a will. This is a very bad phase. To read some of the Ritualist journals (within the last four or five years) is to read both the impeachment of Catholicity and the profession of wilful disobedience. In the place of the first humility there is disdain; instead of searching for truth there is complacency; for the love of unity there is contentment with isolation; for fear of judgment there is judicial contempt. This is the last development of Ritualism. And Englishmen perceiving it, say that Ritualism began well, but has ended in the darkest sectarianism.

Nor can such an attitude admit of amendment. The Anglican bishops, especially the primate, treat the Ritualists as if they were proud children, and the Ritualists retort by writing savagely or contemptuously of the nominees of a Gladstone or a Disraeli. A

Ritualist would no more obey his own bishop, if he could help it, than he would obey the Baptist preacher of the Surrey Tabernacle. He would resist him in the law courts and in his pulpit. He would not sacrifice one jot of his own opinions—not so much as one equivocal practice—at the bidding of his lawful diocesan. If the bishop could be transformed into a “Catholic”—as the Ritualist so fantastically calls himself—then it might become possible to obey him; but to obey a bishop who does not submit himself to *him*, but has the presumption to order him to “put out his candles,” would be a timorous and culpable unfaithfulness, enough to brand him (in his own eyes) as a heretic. So that between disobedience to bishops, isolation from his own Church, contempt for his brother Protestants, and irritation towards the Holy See, the Ritualist stands alone in superb misery, “Ritualisticus contra mundum,” *i. e.*, unique. He owns no communion with anybody. His own Church looks upon him as a wild dreamer; even his favorite Greek Church rejects his Orders; the Colonial, “British Branches,” do not approve of him; and “Rome” simply orders him to obey. Poor Ritualist! To be an old-fashioned Protestant was to be consistent, because it meant, “I interpret the Bible for myself;” but to be a new-fashioned Ritualist is to profess obedience to authority, that authority being throned in Number One.

There cannot be, as we have suggested, any further development of a Protestantism which has reached this last stage. What is there to be developed? Even the imagination cannot supply any further excesses in the direction of theoretical inconsistency. We had witnessed, in bygone days, the rabid hatred of all authority, as demonstrated by ultra-Protestant clergymen; we had witnessed the tempered praise of *some* authority, as demonstrated by moderate High Churchmen; and we have now seen the assumption of Catholic powers negatived by personal schism and revolt. What additional strange Protestantism can there be? Unless the Ritualists were to invent a private pope of their own, and endow him with Ritualistic infallibility, it is scarcely possible that a new phase of wild anomaly should dawn on the used-up English changes. But the assembling of an ecumenical council, which should consist of five-and-twenty Ritualistic clergymen, assisted by the *Church Times* and the *Church Review* as theological advisers or assessors, and which should infallibly decree that the Archbishop of Canterbury must be made infallible in faith and in morals, though it is possible that his Grace would object to this, and which should confer on him that mysterious *grace d'état* which would sublimate him into the exact opposite of what he is, it is not easy to picture any future development of Anglican or Ritualistic phenomena. There must therefore be necessarily a going back. That

movement has, in truth, long begun. Ritualism now covers as much misgiving or skepticism as any other of the Anglican sects. Its outer robe, its *mise en scène*, is still decorous, and it charms with pretty music, pretty gestures; but to suppose that it holds the intellect or the conscience, that it does more than fill a gap in public cravings, is to suppose that the English mind has lost its ballast. Still, one thing the new idealism has certainly effected, it has pulled up the standard of church services. "Æstheticism" has become the fashion throughout England. Even where Ritualist doctrines are repudiated Ritualist decorum is imitated. For an example, take St. Paul's Cathedral, in London,—which used to be as unseemly in regard to its services as any other Protestant church in the land,—there is now a *mise en scène*, which, though it is not Ritualistic, shows a sense of obligation to be stately. But, let it be asked, what is the reach of this innovation? what is the real compass of its gain? The answer we must assume to be this, it means "we should like to be somebody, but we know that we are only nobody, dressed up." Propriety, not priesthood, is demonstrated. The singing, and the robing, and the posturing, and the processioning are all expository of fitness and seemliness; but the congregation has no more *to do* with the services than they have to do with the pealing of the bells. The sermon, too, is all platitudes or proprieties. The preacher has to steer between rocks. He reads a sermon which, but for traditional gravity, may be read or extemporized in a conventicle. There is no touch of divine authority in his teaching. How should there be? since the bishop, or the dean, or the canons, or the choir might correct the preacher's "views" on every doctrine. The whole display is like homage to the national conscience, more than like the homage of divine faith. It is suggestive of the earnest desire to be religious, but not of the full knowledge of religion. It is an effort, an inspiration—not a possession. Whereas, in a Catholic church, we feel that "God is;" the question suggested by Anglican churches is "Where?"

Now it would be interesting to go back into the long story of Church of Englandism, and search for the original elements of Ritualism. It is perfectly true that Ritualism is not Church of Englandism, but it is a natural, an inevitable outcome of it. Let us be pardoned, for the sake of the interest of the subject, if we devote a few minutes to a search back. The point we would consider is, how has Ritualism been developed out of a system which was its contrary in everything?

And we would say, first, that *every* development of Anglicanism has been the most natural thing in the world. Let us briefly run through its whole story. Of Anglicanism, in the reign of Henry VIII., it would be absurd to say more than that it was a royal

tyranny. Of Anglicanism, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, it would be absurd to say more than that it was a royal interest. In both reigns there was coarse, brutal tyranny, and this alone forced the Protestantism on the people. The Stuarts had to deal with a Church ready to hand, which Church two of the Tudors had created for them. The Stuarts made the most of the doctrine of divine right, which right was now centred in the king. Charles I. made too much of the divine right, and lost his head through being pontiff and despot. Amiable in his own character, he was out of joint with his times, in which the people were quite as Puritan as they were loyal. Oliver Cromwell made use of Puritanism as his trump card, and put Catholics out of the pale of Christianity and Anglicans out of the pale of civilization. The Restoration did something to restore both to their religious rights, but between the Cavaliers and the Roundheads there existed an animosity which sorely puzzled the amiable worldliness of Charles II. Whether his playful Majesty died a Catholic it is difficult to decide; but his successor, James II., had Mass said in his palace, and even invited all his courtiers to be present. Not satisfied with the private practice of his religion he sought to compel his subjects to respect it; and Mass was said at Westminster with every accompaniment of regal pomp, for the first time after an interval of a hundred years. We know what that restoration cost James. His religion and his revival of regal absolutism, both together, drove him out of the country. His cruelty towards Dissenters and towards Puritans of every school, assisted to hasten his downfall; indeed not even under Laud had Nonconformists been so harshly treated or with more unjust or more impolitic contempt. James II. might have done something for English Catholics, but all he did was to postpone their popular favor for nearly another two hundred years.

In treating of Ritualism from an historical point of view,—that is, in trying to trace its antecedents,—we shall find that both before and after the time of James II. it had continual though long-developing causes. Ritualism is as much a social as a religious movement; it is as much a matter of caste as of principle; it is not only a result of grave political mistakes, but of the social confusions which sprang from them. It is impossible to dissociate the modern rise of "sacerdotalism" from the antecedent degradation of "ministry;" and it is impossible to dissociate the present struggle for clerical caste from the antecedent social fall of the clergy. Action and reaction have been the story of Anglicanism, not only in doctrine but in social place. Let us very briefly illustrate our meaning by a few glances at historical causes.

Henry VIII., who turned the monks out of doors that he might make presents of their property to his courtiers, did not consider,

in the wildness of his passions, that he was insulting the very profession of religion. Edward VI., poor little boy, who, through his unscrupulous agents, made havoc of what was left of Christianity, did not consider, in his childhood, that a little-boy-pope was the very thing to shock the dignity of the clergy. Queen Elizabeth, who threatened to "unfrock her clergy," having made herself the judge of their true Orders, did not consider how absurd was the idea of a female pontiff, nor how the reaction from such a mockery must produce High Churchism. James I. and Charles I., in treating Puritans with contempt, many of whom were good and thoughtful men, while at the same time treating the clergy as state officers, did not consider that in "playing the Superior" over both religion and its teachers they were really making the "divine right" to seem profane, and were thus paving the way to a reaction of pretension proportionate to the degree of the affront. Yet the affront, both to religion and to its teachers, did not reach its full insolence under the Stuarts. James II. may have meant well as a Catholic, but he cast indignity on the "National" clergy, and so by alienating the clergy as well as the Nonconformists, he made both to hate the state as their oppressor. But it was not until after what is called the Revolution, when the Stuarts were finally dethroned, that the Anglican clergy were reduced to their lowest depths, and therefore began to struggle for position. Under William III. and Mary an Anglican clergyman was so degraded that he was scarcely so respectable as a footman. He was not deemed a fit companion for a butler. A gentleman's chaplain was expected to act as gardener as well as to read the church services. He might "say grace" before and after dinner, but he "went down with the tablecloth into the kitchen." Socially he was nobody, ecclesiastically he was but a servant *in spiritualibus*, morally he was not expected to be typical, and intellectually he was only required to be able to read. This degradation of the clergy could not possibly endure; it was as insulting to the Christian conscience as to Christianity, and so under the Georges the clerical caste gradually rose, until about a hundred years ago it became "gentlemanly." But religion having been so long disesteemed, its teachers could not be expected to be exemplary. Socially they might be now well regarded; but ministerially they had utterly lost place. We therefore find that during the reigns of the last two Georges the higher sorts of country clergymen were fox-hunters, and the higher sorts of town clergymen were "diners-out." Both were simply gentlemen, wearing a white necktie on Sunday, and drinking their bottle or two of port every weekday. A bishop was but a grand social don. A rector was a most respectable gentleman. A rector's daughters might be married to peers; even a curate might marry a knight's daughter.

Every clergyman of every grade was well educated. Scholarship became the fashion among the clergy, and was very often the credential for a benefice. At the beginning of the reign of William IV. the social position of an "English clergyman" was established and was unchallenged for its stern respectability.

We come now to a period when another great reaction—yet perfectly natural, nay, inevitable—shook the very foundations of the "Establishment." What is known as "Evangelicalism" was that new burst of earnestness which woke up sleepy parsons and state bishops. Emotion took the place of dry scholarship, and fervid preaching of "Essays on the Evidences." The dry bones of the Establishment were quickened into life by the real earnestness and piety of the Evangelicals. It is perfectly true that there had always been a High and a Low Church party; that the High Church party had been always divided into two sections, the High as to ecclesiastical polity, and the High as to Christian doctrine; and that the Low Church party had been always divided into two sections, the Latitudinarians and the Puritans; but the Evangelicals were in one sense a new school, that they were at once fervent Christians and "good churchmen." In other words, they were attached to the Church of England, while they sat loosely to every doctrine save the Atonement. This new consistency may perhaps be thus explained. It must be remembered that the early controversies and divisions of the Church of England had been always aggravated, if not created, by political passions, "Church and State" being the watchword both of respectability and patriotism, though interpretable by each man's proclivity. So long as there were fierce contests about ecclesiastical supremacy, or persecutions of the Irish Catholics, or the Scotch Covenanters, or High Commissions which insulted both the Universities, or the total suspension of Convocation by the state, there were plenty of causes for political religiousness, or for making politics and religion the same thing. But when the time came that fierce political passions were no longer associated with religious sentiment, it became possible for an Anglican to be attached to his church on the simple ground that it cherished Christian sentiment. Thus the new Evangelicals were, in reality, earnest Christians, who sought, without reference to temporalities, to galvanize the dry bones of Anglicanism. They did an incalculable amount of good. All England is indebted to their enthusiasm. But for them it may be questioned whether the Oxford Revival would have had a precedent basis of earnestness on which to work. Yet, strange to say, the Evangelicals, who were so earnest about piety, cared little about dogmas or even tenets, while they simply abhorred the exaltation of ritual, or even so much as its recognition or mention. Their churches were like

barns, their surplices were seldom washed, their pulpits always obscured the communion table, and their fonts were always put out of sight. From this neglect of every function save preaching, and from this contempt of all outward symbols of the faith, sprang that natural reaction which was first known as Puseyism, and which afterwards developed into Ritualism. Puseyism was both doctrinal and decorous, but it stopped short at an earnest search for "primitive truth." Ritualism proudly declared that it had found primitive truth, and that no one else but the Ritualist had done so. He that was not a Ritualist might certainly be a Catholic,—the Greek and Roman communions were esteemed Catholic,—but the Church of England was *the* primitive church; that is, the small section of Anglicans who were Ritualists. No longer was there search after primitive truth—such search as the first Puseyites had instituted; no longer was there the preaching of the duty of obedience—which had proved the really Catholic spirit of the first Puseyites. There was only dogmatic egotism, which made number one the whole Church, and excommunicated disobedient bishops.

We have suggested that clerical caste, both official and personal, had much to do with the development of Ritualism. About fifty years ago "theological colleges" were first started, and men were admitted to Orders without degrees. This important innovation led soon to the introduction of a socially inferior class into the clerical ranks. The new candidates might be, in all respects, superior men. They might even, socially, be gentlemen, but the old-fashioned prejudice in favor of graduate clergymen was somewhat shocked by a "Curate from St. Bee's." Clerical social caste being slightly depreciated clerical power must be proportionately uplifted; nor is there anything censorious in the suggestion that personal "caste" had some charm of strong argument for the clerical mind. It is certain that, socially, Anglican clergymen have lost caste, and that, sacerdotally, they have sought to regain it. Whereas forty years ago even the average country curate was thought socially a fair match for the squire's daughter, the average country curate now plumes himself on his "priesthood" as being a far higher credential than social caste.

Historically Ritualism is the development of a reaction from "Church and State" principles or Erastianism. Doctrinally Ritualism is the development of a reaction from evangelical indefiniteness and sentimentalism. Socially Ritualism is the development of clerical pique at loss of clerical caste or position. Religiously Ritualism is the development of the aspiration after fixedness in doctrine and practice. Still, Ritualism is, in some respects, a going back. Ritualism has all the weak points of Puseyism, weak points which were never cherished by the Puseyites, with but very little of

the simple, hearty search after the true way to become a good Catholic. We are speaking only, of course, of a religious system; we are not presuming to pass judgment on individuals. It would be impertinent as well as wicked even to suggest of a single Ritualist that he is not in good faith and in earnest. Nor should we think of judging the Ritualists by their newspapers, which are often ultra Protestant in spirit. Nor do we suppose that even refractory Ritualist "priests," who disobey their Bishops in almost everything, are at all aware that they are "a Church unto themselves," that, in fact, that they are Dissenters. We must look at the whole system as a mere theory, as a perfectly natural development of worn-out Anglicanism. It is the last despairing struggle of the moribund. "Let us not die without one final effort to convert rank English Protestantism into Catholicity." It was a natural if not a laudable effort. It has failed. To make the Church of England Catholic is about as hopelessly impossible as to convert the Catholic Roman Church into a sect. A communion which has passed through every vicissitude of doctrine, as well as through every contrary of practice, yet which has existed for more than three centuries as the stoutest champion in the whole world of vigorous Protestantism, is not likely in its old age to be recreated out of itself into what it never was, is not, and never can be. Ritualism has been the death-blow of Church of Englandism. It has proved, by its "reason of being," that all that went before it was wrong; and it has proved by its present isolation that it is itself quite as wrong as its forerunners. It is insular even in insular England. Never was there anything less Catholic. All the world, save the Ritualists, can see this. Catholicity was not born at St. Albans, at Hatcham, nor even at Oxford. It is not national, nor separate, nor individual. It is indeed the opposite of Ritualism. Catholicity says, come and be one with us. Ritualism says, would to God we could be one, even with our own sect.

THE REHABILITATION OF CATHOLIC TERMS IN DICTIONARIES OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

AMONG the wrongs that Catholics should seek to have redressed is the present shameful treatment of Catholic terms in all extant dictionaries of our language. Exclusion of all that savored of our religious language and practices were after the Reformation a rule steadily persisted in, till dictionaries gave no one a clear definition of a term in use among Catholics. As the suppression of Catholic books after the change of religion in England was relentlessly enforced, and the introduction of books treating of our faith, worship, or practices prohibited under the severest penalties, the knowledge of all the religious nomenclature of our language in use at the beginning of the sixteenth century died out among those who did not belong to the faith; and at the same time the open use of peculiarly Catholic terms by man or woman was enough to betray the speaker to pursuivants and priest-hunters, and they were thus removed in a manner from the public by a sort of Discipline of the Secret.

An English judge once declared that in the eyes of the law Catholics were not supposed to exist in the British Isles, and on the same principle the religious terms and expressions in use among them were adjudged to be lost, obsolete, dead, and forgotten.

When at last some words began to creep into dictionaries as if under protest from others, the meaning given was in many cases an insult to us or an insult to common-sense. For definitions the lexicographers went to Protestant sources, and while in no class of terms even at this day is the nomenclature complete, the definition is frequently utterly absurd.

While Catholic terms were excluded, every odious nickname and term of opprobrium that the filthiest hearts could engender found their place in English dictionaries, and were paraded as though the indecencies were something of which our language felt a high and noble pride. Had Walker become a Catholic before he issued his dictionary there would have been accuracy in his definitions, but his work was in the hands of the public when he embraced the faith, and no other lexicographer has known our devotional language.

To the credit of some of our dictionaries in this country, notably Webster's, attempts have been made to remedy the evil, but the disease is beyond the mere passing treatment; it requires radical, systematic, and thorough cure.

But it will be objected that a dictionary of the English language cannot be expected to give in full the terminology in use in all

religious denominations, some of which employ words for a time and then allow them to fall into disuse. But many such terms originating within the last century are given, and no denomination has a vocabulary so intimately interwoven in the language as the Catholic, whose terminology grew up with the English tongue, when the Church, engaged in its civilizing work, transformed Saxon and Norman into one people by the unity of faith.

The Catholic terms cannot be treated as novelties. The words that were familiar in every English home five centuries ago and more, which have been uninterruptedly used in the castle homes of the most ancient of the noble families of the three kingdoms, in the manor houses of Catholic gentry who can boast a more unsullied record than post-Reformation nobles, in the homes of sturdy yeomen and peasantry, too brave and incorruptible to barter their faith for monarch's frown or parliamentary bribe, the words constituting their devotional language cannot be treated as novelties or justly excluded from a volume that professes to give the English of those who speak and write the language in our day.

The present is especially the moment when this subject should be brought up, because the most pretentious dictionary ever yet prepared is soon to go to press. A proposal was issued in 1859 for the publication of a new English dictionary by the Philological Society of Great Britain. The meanings of words are to be attested by examples showing the use of each word by writers in successive centuries. To attain this involved, of course, immense labor, and many gentlemen in the British Isles and in America have been reading the literature of each period in order to give the necessary examples. These collaborators have all been working on a common plan, according to certain definite and prescribed rules. It does not appear, however, that the works of Catholic writers have been assigned for perusal with a view to give the meanings of the religious terms used, showing their antiquity and constant use. If this immense work is to come forth as its predecessors have done, using Protestant controversialists and lexicographers as the highest available standard for the definition of Catholic terms, as though a man who did not hear terms used, did not use them himself, or move among those who used them, who never read the books current among those who used them, is best fitted to explain them, then will it not merely add one more to the list of absurdities?

Every Catholic knows that the English works of the last three centuries teem with blunders arising from the utter ignorance of the writers as to everything relating to Catholic doctrine, worship, devotional life, and thought. Even where writers seem to have meant well, with only dictionaries to aid them, which were blind

guides leading the blind, they jumble and confuse things in a manner that elicits a hearty laugh from the Catholic reader.

One would suppose that any person studying the history of the Middle Ages, and especially any one attempting to write on that period, would make himself familiar with the worship and religious usages and terms of that period, when the Church occupied so important a place in European affairs; but the very contrary is the fact, and each one thinks himself at liberty to flounder and blunder, when he would be the laughing-stock of all critics if he should commit a tithe of the absurdities in treating a topic of ancient Rome or Greece. One of our brilliant authors justly remarks:¹ "Even such as Walter Scott and Washington Irving commit blunders which are incomprehensible to men whose education is far inferior to that of those masters. In their works we find Catholics going to Mass at all hours of the afternoon and evening, confessing to and receiving absolution from laymen, and men, women, and children in general using breviaries and missals. A well-educated author, a Protestant, is required to know the meaning of the Ramadan, the Mishna, the Norwegian Sagas, Joe Smith, the Mormon, the Yezidees, the Fetish, but is allowed to blunder like an idiot about Mass, Vespers, and Rosary, the highest and most frequent acts of worship of two hundred millions of Christian men, half of whom are of the leading races of civilization in France, Spain, North America, Germany, Italy, and Great Britain."

This ignorance must be gross indeed when an Everett tells us in print that he saw Ursuline nuns at New Orleans saying Mass!

And yet, *absit omen*, the English Philological Society threatens us with a dictionary in which the Catholic terms are to be defined as understood and used by this precious collection of ignoramuses. Yet they profess to possess common-sense, and will go to some work on steam-engines for the names of the different parts and the terms employed by those who manage such engines, but will act, we fear, on the principle that the man who knows nothing of the Catholic religion and abuses it heartily is the best authority available for giving the public the meaning of the terms used by adherents of that faith.

The war on the devotional language of England is thus a curious one from a merely philological point of view. By a statute of 3 and 4 Edward VI. all antiphoners, missals, grailes, processionals, manuals, legends, pies, portuasses, primers in English and Latin, couchers, journals, ordinals, or other books or writings whatsoever, heretofore used for service of the Church, written or printed in the English or Latin tongue, other than such as shall be

¹ McLeod, *Devotion to the Blessed Virgin in North America*, p. 19.

set forth by the king's majesty, were "utterly abolished, extinguished, and forbidden forever to be used or kept in this realm or elsewhere within any of the king's dominions." They were to be delivered up to the bailiff, constable, or churchwardens, and then within three months to be destroyed by the archbishop, bishop, chancellor, or commissary of the diocese. The penalty for neglecting to surrender them was for the first offence ten shillings, for the second four pounds, for the third imprisonment during the king's pleasure; and if the archbishop or other executioner neglected to burn the books delivered to him he forfeited forty pounds. These books comprised not only those used by the clergy in the divine service, but the manuals and primers, then the prayer-books of the faithful, and the legends, that is, lives of the saints.

Omar's destruction of all books was not more summary. That anything escaped this monstrous edict is a matter of wonder. People would be sure to give up every doubtful book, and England under the force of this heathenish act of folly destroyed by the hundred the manuscript devotional manuals and pious literature of preceding centuries, and the first and now priceless issues of the printing press in England, wherever they bore on religion. The Caxtons, Wynken de Wordes, and other incunabula, were given to the flames; early translations of the Bible, commentaries, devotional treatises, swelled the flames of this hecatomb of religious hate.

Caxton's biographer, Blades, phrases it more mildly, merely qualifying the Church of England as sectarian. Speaking of the scanty array that now can be gathered of the works that issued from the press of England's first printer, the truly pious Catholic Caxton, some of which are but fragments or single leaves, he says: "A glance at the titles of the uniques will show that the books most liable to destruction, probably owing in part to their being much used, and in part to the destructiveness of religious sectarianism, are those directly or indirectly of an ecclesiastical character, such as 'Horæ' (prayer-books), 'Psalters,' 'Meditations,' etc."

The list of Caxtons now is made up from the books and fragments that escaped the flames; what books perished it is utterly impossible to tell, as there is no authoritative record of what he printed.

To effect the change of religion in England the first step was to destroy utterly all books that embodied the devotional language which had obtained from the definite formation of the English tongue. It was prohibited within the walls of the churches which had been erected for the Catholic worship, and had so long echoed to its rites and devotions. In hundreds of places ignorant fellows, donning a clerical garb, were vociferating abuse against the old

faith, and spelling out the newfangled service to unaccustomed ears, and propounding new devotional ideas in terms adopted for the nonce from local dialect, or coined with that facility for the invention of slang which is characteristic.

It required time for a new devotional language to take form and shape, and as the people had good sense enough to hold back from adopting a religion forced on them by rulers who had no honor or decency and no pretence to piety or godliness, the progress of these forms of speech was slow. It required time to pass from the jargon state to that of language. It was at last embodied after Elizabeth's long reign in the King James's Bible, very often called "authorized," probably because no one ever authorized it.

On the other hand, one great value of the Rheim-Douay Bible (1582-1609) is that it is a monumental work of the highest linguistic value from the fact that it embodies the religious language of England during so many preceding centuries. While it is homogeneous, and distinctively English and the English of all England, the King James's Bible is, by the admission of the very Philological Society which is preparing the new dictionary, a hotch-potch, representing the language of no part of the island and of no period of its history.

Our devotional language bears the imprint of nobility and high descent; the new is the shoddy upstart. And so little has our language of prayer changed in three centuries that devotions from what few Caxtons escaped the Edwardine flames might be printed in modern spelling in our Catholic prayer-books to-day and the faithful at large would scarcely suspect their antiquity.

Although the Roman missal and breviary have superseded those of Sarum, Aberdeen, and others that were in use in the British Isles at the apostasy, although clergy and religious were for two centuries trained in various parts of the Continent, although new devotions have arisen, yet the number of obsolete and obsolescent words and of neologisms in our devotional language is comparatively small.

A dictionary to be of any practicable value in our times should distinguish all these, and not mislead people by giving some obsolete term as still in use, or what is worse, giving some doubtful or local term, or term whose use was of most limited range, as being still a word in actual use. New terms, that is, those introduced since the change of religion in England, should be given as the current words where they have superseded the earlier expressions.

It is needless to say that there should be some system. The names of the Seven Sacraments should be all given; the different orders up to the priesthood, the gradations in the hierarchy, the vestments or dress peculiar to each, the church plate and furniture,

books, devotions, etc., with such definitions that an intelligent reader referring to the dictionary would obtain a distinct idea of the meaning of the word. Yet all this is given in our dictionaries in a most fragmentary and incorrect way. Some terms are given, and others of the class omitted which the reader will naturally look for; and at times words are used in definitions which do not appear in the dictionary with an explanation.

The old French-English dictionaries used to sin the other way. The Catholic terms were in the dictionary of the French Academy, and as a rule had to be retained, but instead of giving the corresponding English word the compilers, generally Huguenots, took occasion to give a fling at Catholics by inserting a definition to suit their own ideas, leaving the person using the dictionary to find out the proper term as best he might, or stick in the French word for want of a better. Thus: "Chasuble, s. f., a sort of priest's ornament used at Mass;" "Neuvaine, s. f. (with Papists), nine days during which prayers are made in some popish church in honor of some saint in order to implore his assistance."

Now let us take up a few of the words familiar to the twenty millions of English-speaking Catholics now scattered far and wide over the surface of the earth; terms used on the arid plains of inland Australia, through the well-watered republic of America, in England's fairest lands, and the green fields of Ireland. Our religious language is one. Many indeed are the tongues of those who follow men-made creeds, there is but one among us of the deathless faith.

Let us take the book our clergy have ever in hand, which we meet them poring over when we call for ghostly counsel; which we see them reading with fixed gaze and moving lip in our railroad car, or on the steamer's deck, indifferent to all around them.

Now let us see what idea our dictionaries convey to a person who meets the word and is seeking information in regard to this book and its parts.

The "breviary," Webster tells us, is "a book containing the daily services of the Roman Catholic or Greek Church. It is composed of matins, lauds, first, third, sixth, and ninth vespers, and the compline or post communio."

Worcester more briefly says: "The book containing the daily service of the Church of Rome. (Bishop Usher.)"

Boag, *A Popular and Complete English Dictionary*, London, 1848, takes the opportunity to insult us: "Breviary, a book containing the daily service of the *Romish* Church."

Clarke, *A New and Comprehensive Dictionary*, London, 1855, gives very blindly: "The daily service-book of the Roman Catholics."

It is hard to conceive anything more absurd than making vespers from first to ninth, or confounding compline, one of the canonical hours, with the post communio, a prayer in the Mass. Led by such guides was doubtless that American educator who in a book intended to teach teachers, gravely tells them that the breviary is a textbook in Catholic colleges; or the learned editor of Chaucer, who gives one of the canonical hours as the definition for another of the hours. Worcester and the English dictionaries are so vague that the expressions they employ will define missal or prayer-book as much as they do breviary.

Now the breviary contains the devotions for the canonical hours of prayer, required by the laws of the Church to be said or chanted by priests and members of religious orders. It is not styled a service but an office, and the word office is actually among Catholics so well recognized that one told that the priest, for whom he asks, is saying his office, understands that he is reciting the appropriate part of his breviary. "And such as have obligation to the canonical hours must at least read the whole office privately, if they be not present where it is sang." (Douay Bible, 1609, Pref. to Psalms.) It is clear then that the definition should contain elements omitted in these dictionaries. The breviary is a book, generally in four volumes, adapted to the four seasons, containing the office or devotions obligatory on Catholic priests and religious at the canonical hours, viz.: Matins, Lauds, Prime, Tierce, Sext, None, Vespers or Even-song, and Compline.

Worcester, it will be noticed, cites Bishop Usher, a Protestant, for its definition, resorting to ignorant and prejudiced sources for information.

So much for the breviary. Now let us look for its companion on every priest's table, the diurnal. This word appears in both the American and English dictionaries, but not one has any definition referring to this Catholic book, although Webster, in the matter of derivation, refers to the same word in French and Spanish as meaning a prayer-book.

If we take up the parts of the breviary we will find no little confusion. Webster's definition of Matins is intelligible, but Worcester's "the earliest hours of prayer in Catholic worship," Boag's "morning service or worship," and Clarke's "morning prayers," give no definite idea except as to time. Lauds, we are informed by Webster, are "prayers formerly used between Matins and Prime," and Worcester coupling it with insult has "(Romish Church) prayers formerly read at daybreak after Matins, (Brande.)"

Under *Hours*, Webster's definition would give an idea, but Worcester's citing Brande, a Protestant, is as blind as possible. Boag, as usual, insults us, while Clark says, "a Catholic prayer-book,"

which is incorrect, as the old form, now disused, was "Book of Hours."

Here we come upon a sort of clue to the whole matter. With an insolence that may well be termed audacious, the existence of Catholics and Catholicity, since a new religion was established by law in England, is utterly ignored. Twenty millions of English-speaking Catholics are treated as non-existent, or dumb driven cattle, that use no language of devotion. On the word of a man named Brande, these dictionaries assure all who go to them for information that Lauds are no longer recited in the Catholic Church. Now we might ask, on what they base this, where they find any authority for it? Are Lauds suppressed in the breviary now printed for the use of the Catholic clergy, or in the Holy Week Books in the hands of the laity? Every Catholic knows that they are not, and that Lauds are said as they always have been.

Prime fares better; but if the dictionaries contrive to show a little common-sense here, the editor of Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, published by Routledge, evinces folly enough to atone for their offence. Where in the *Persone's Tale* it is stated that venial sin is forgiven "by general confession of Confiteor at Masse and at Prime, and at Compline," this sage and learned individual gives a footnote explaining Prime to be "early Matins, and Compline to be Even-song!" No Milesian was ever accused of defining six o'clock to be nine o'clock, but it seems that a learned English editor may do things of that kind.

Ignoring all Catholic usage of the present and preceding centuries, all English dictionaries omit the next canonical hours, Tierce and Sext, as they ignore the Diurnal that contains them. The notes to the 118th Psalm in the Douay Bible of 1609, after speaking of the Nocturns add, "Whereto also the Laudes are added. The Prime in the morning. Afterwards the Third houre, Sixt, Ninth, and in the evening Even-song and Compline." Tierce, here called the Third Houre, was, in earlier times, called Undern. ("Abouten Underne," Chaucer's Clerke's Tale and Nonne's Preeste's Tale. "Before Undrone sall thou thynke of the passion," The Mirror of St. Edmund, in Religious Pieces, p. 41.) The explanations of this Saxon term are not clear, and we have looked in vain in the *Restitution of Decayed Intelligence*, by that good old Catholic antiquarian, Richard Verstegan, for anything regarding it.

In all the little offices given in our old Catholic manuals since the time of the Douay, Tierce or Terce prevails. Sixt was also called Midday. ("Before Mid-daye sall thou thynke of the anunciacyone and of Jhesu passion," St. Edmund.) But in all our manuals these two hundred years and more, Sext and Tierce have

supplanted the Saxon words. Sext is not given in our dictionaries and Tierce has not its ecclesiastical definition.

As to Nones Clarke has merely "prayers," and Boag, "prayers formerly so called." Webster gives "a season of prayer formerly observed at noon in the Roman Catholic Church (Todd)," and Worcester, "prayers formerly celebrated in the Catholic Church at noon (Todd)." If Todd is a Pope who dispensed the Catholic clergy and religious from saying Nones, it is strange that they never discovered the fact, but keep on saying that part of the Divine office. If he is not a Catholic dignitary of any kind, but a Protestant who knows nothing really of the Catholic terms he professed to explain, we must insist that it is about as sensible to go to him or Brande for definitions of Catholic terms as it would be to go to a blacksmith for an accurate explanation of nice distinctions in law terms. The word None appears very early, and had apparently no Saxon correspondent. It is the origin of our word noon according to the general opinion.

"Vespers or Even-song," is still the expression in all our older Catholic prayer-books in the hands of the faithful. "Before even-sange," says St. Edmund; and "Even-song" is given in the Douay Bible already cited, and "Vespers or Even-song" is given in an English Dictionary by Coles, 1717, but our modern dictionaries confound everything. Webster gives "Vespers, the evening song or evening service in the Roman Catholic Church;" "Even-song, a song for the evening; a form of worship for the evening." And Worcester: "Vespers, the evening song or service of the Roman Catholic Church (Seward)." "Even-song, a song or hymn for the evening." Neither of these dictionaries, like the older English one, gives Even-song as the equivalent for Vespers, or Vespers for Even-song. Neither states that it is one of the canonical hours of the Church, or connects it in any way with the Breviary. The English dictionaries are nearly the same. Boag of course insults us: "Vespers, the evening song or evening service in the Romish Church." Clarke does the same: "Vespers, Romish evening service."

In defining Compline Webster and Boag refer to the Breviary, but Worcester and Clarke are very vague.

A Catholic who will look at the words Office, Nocturn, Antiphon, will see how queerly, following such guides as Eden, Todd, and Hook, they confuse the simplest things. Tenebræ does not appear in their columns at all.

We have thus considered only the word Breviary and those necessarily connected with it. As our readers see the subject is not treated as a whole, nor the different terms with any reference to

one another, but to each is given a haphazard definition from some source utterly destitute of authority.

The same incongruity meets us in other parts. Many people, as we have found, have a very confused idea of masses as musical compositions and the Mass as an ecclesiastical rite. The writer once tried for a long time, but in vain, to get a Protestant gentleman to understand that Pergolesi, Cherubini, Mozart, and other composers did not invent the prayers and ceremonies of the Mass, but merely composed music to be played or sung during its celebration. Worcester makes the distinction between the word in the ecclesiastical and musical sense, but Webster does not, and both define Mass in a Protestant way that offends Catholic ears, and the latter makes the oblation follow the consecration. Altar is very vague in Webster, and more clearly defined in Worcester, who gives altar-cloth, which the former omits. Boag gives it also.

If we take up the vestments, *Chasuble*, omitted by Boag, is by the others defined without any reference to color; alb is described without anything to give the reader to understand that it is a vestment worn at Mass; amice is defined by Boag and Worcester intelligibly, but no one unacquainted with the matter could glean any definite idea from Webster. Maniple and stole are confused in both, especially in the English works, and they say nothing of their being part of a priest's vestments at Mass, or of the fact that they correspond in color and material with the chasuble. Coles's old English dictionary defines amice and stole more intelligibly than our modern lexicographers, and he gives "Antependium, the cloth before the altar," which does not appear in our later dictionaries. Yet the glossary in Oakeley on *Catholic Worship* would have given all needed accurately.

Minor orders are unknown to our lexicographers, who make the subdeacon a deacon's servant, and an acolyte an inferior church servant. We need not be astonished, then, to find the deacon's dalmatic defined by Webster as a long white gown with sleeves, when it is short, and depends for color on the day, and the sleeves are but an apology. The subdeacon's tunic fares worse at their hands. It is defined "a long under-garment," when it is really short and an outer vestment, not an under-garment at all. They cite Wright as an authority when "Wrong" would have been more to the point.

The seven sacraments are generally enumerated under the word sacrament, but penance and extreme unction are rarely defined as sacraments.

If we turn to devotions, rosary is pretty fairly defined; but under beads the term "bidding of beads" is paraded in several of these works, although it seems to rest solely on anti-Catholic tracts in the

Reformation times, while the fact that beads, or a "pair of beads," designates the third part of the rosary, the five decades, as generally used among Catholics, is omitted. The good old woman who asks for a pair of beads does not know that she employs a term that may be termed classical in English. Chaucer used it centuries ago in his *Prologue*: "About hire arm she bare a pair of bedes." Sir Thomas More used it at a later day in his *Dialogue of Comfort* (Antwerp, 1573; p. 80): "His Confessor shooke his great paier of beads upon him." The contemporaneous life of Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel, gives it, speaking of the pious Countess: "She used to wear about her neck either a cross of gold . . . or else a plain pair of beads sent unto her by Father Claudius Aquaviva, General of the Society of Jesus."

Rosary and scapular seems allied, so let us turn on any of our dictionaries to the latter word. What do we find? A very comical definition, credited to Brande or Brevint, of the scapular as part of the religious habit, but of the Scapular of Mount Carmel, worn by millions of the laity, not a syllable in the English or American dictionaries. Our Catholic besides a scapular probably wears a medal. The dictionaries defining the word can scarcely be said to include the religious medals so common among us. If lexicographers do not regard them as having any existence we are afraid that the custom-house officers do and would seize them if we attempted to pass them without paying duty. Some one may ask me whether my beads and medals are indulgenced. If I turn to the dictionaries I find the word *indulgential* with a definition credited to Brevint; a most unusual term it must be, but the common expression indulgenced is not mentioned.

Should devotion prompt us we might begin a novena in honor of some mystery of our Lord's life, or in honor of the Blessed Virgin or some saint. But novena is in no English dictionary that we can find. Deletanville in his old French-English dictionary defines the French word without giving the English term, and our lexicographers all seem to have feared that some calamity might befall them in case they inserted it in their columns, so cautiously all avoid it. The word is no neologism. A little volume entitled *A Novena to St. Francis Xavier* was printed as far back as 1741 (18mo., pp. 88), and the term is used throughout the book without explanation, showing clearly that it was a word perfectly understood among Catholics in the early part of the last century.

Religion in the sense of the religious state is not given in our dictionaries, although we find its use in the fourteenth century. See *Religious Pieces*, published by the Early Text Society (p. 9), or the *Life of Lady Warner of Parham in Suffolk: In Religion called Sister Clare of Jesus*, London, 1692. In the last century it is used

in the same sense by Blackstone in his *Commentaries*. Religious indeed appears with the meaning "a person bound by monastic vows, as a monk, a friar, a nun," but Webster assures us that the word is obsolete.

Printers distinguish between monks and friars, and the dictionaries, though they note this distinction, confound the two constantly, and though some define the word friar correctly as meaning a member of one of the mendicant orders, Franciscan, Dominican, Augustinian, and Carmelite, yet commit the gross solecism of using in a book intended as a public guide such expressions as "Franciscan monk" or "Dominican monk." Even the Rev. Orby Shipley, in his *Glossary*, has "Dominican monks, preaching black friars," making them both monks and friars, and not giving their distinctive name at all. They put O. P. after their names and call themselves "of the Order of Preachers," or "of the Order of Friars Preachers," they never call themselves either Dominican monks or preaching black friars. We have never found as bad a case in the dictionaries, however, as in a Western contribution to history, where Father Hennepin is said to have been a "Franciscan monk of the Jesuit order," which would be like a "brigadier-general in the navy of the United States judiciary." A Franciscan cannot be a monk, nor a monk a Franciscan; a Jesuit is neither monk nor friar.

The well-meant endeavor in the later editions of Webster to give the names of the religious orders in this country is most commendable, and with a few modifications will be all that is needed.

Under the head *profess*, Clarke gives "to take vows," which needs only the word solemn to be correct; other dictionaries, and even Shipley's *Glossary*, omit the ecclesiastical sense altogether, although Webster and Worcester give "Profession, the act of entering or becoming a member of a religious order;" and Shipley to the same purport, which is not correct, as the profession comes some years after entering. It is given as a term of ecclesiastical law and Bouvier cited as authority. Yet curiously enough there was a law case in England in the last century which turned entirely on the point of a monk having made his profession.

A baronet of the Anderton family became a Benedictine and his younger brother assumed the title and the property. When Charles Edward advanced into England the titular baronet joined him, and after the fatal disaster at Culloden fled to the Continent, leaving his two daughters in England. His estate was declared to be confiscated, but the daughters prevailed on their uncle, the monk, to come forward and claim that the property was really his and had never belonged to his brother at all, no legal title having ever vested in him. The Crown, however, fell back on the old Catholic

law, and maintained that the elder brother had confessed himself to be a monk, that he was therefore dead in law, and that the title and estates had consequently descended to the younger brother, and that the lands were forfeited by his treason. The lawyer for the family, however, insisted that the old law must be taken in its full extent, and that in Catholic times a monk was not dead in law unless he was a monk professed, and they cited authorities establishing this point. The court held that they were right; the Crown was unable to prove the fact of the Benedictine's having taken his last vows or made his profession, and the family saved the property. The curious case is reported, and justifies the use of "profess" and "profession," as good English terms.

Probably, in consequence of the various English editions of Pascal's famous work, the word *provincial* is given in our dictionaries, although some assert that there are provincials of religious orders only in Catholic countries. As there are several provincials in this country, the consequence is clear that if these lexicographers are right this is a Catholic country; but if they are not willing to admit that, they must confess that the dictionaries are wrong. As our regular clergy give frequently retreats to the clergy and religious communities of women and missions in many parishes, we turn to our dictionaries for mission and retreat. *Mission*, in the sense of a series of sermons, instructions, and meditations, is not to be found in any of the dictionaries, though Webster gives a very clear definition of *retreat*.

But we need not pursue further the matter of omissions. As the dictionaries ignore our existence for the last three hundred years, and take their Catholic words from the violent anti-Catholic polemics of the time of the Reformation, there are many words obsolete, distorted, or merely coined at the time which have found their way to dictionaries and been retained from generation to generation. Such words, if preserved at all, ought to be characterized properly so as not to mislead any one.

Then that whole class of opprobrious and insulting words, dragged from the dunghills with the muck-rake, Papist, Popish, Romish, Romanist, Papistical, Popery, these should be distinctly characterized as terms of insult, opprobrium, and degradation, never accepted by Catholics or used by them, but always resented. If dictionaries would note the fact that they are terms of reproach applied to Catholics, many who use them now apparently unconscious of the wound they inflict would shrink from giving pain to others by applying to them words that ought never to fall from the lips of any one having any moral principle or rectitude. Even government publications, like the *Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs*, have been allowed to fall into the hands of persons who

make them a vehicle for carrying out their sectarian hate. A glance at the indexes of the report for the last few years will show how terms of insult to us are employed there when they are not in the report itself, showing conclusively that they are inserted out of pure wantonness.

Now what is the true remedy for all this wretched treatment of Catholic terms? Catholic writers are not cited as authority for the use of words, yet from the earliest English writers down there is a catena of authorities for their use. Many of our catechetical works, old and new, give clear and distinct definitions of Catholic words which might have been adopted to advantage by dictionaries. Rock's *Hierurgia*, Barry's *Sacramentals*, treatises on the Mass, the Ceremonial, Rituals, Oakeley on *Catholic Worship*, with its glossary, would supply other definitions, but lexicographers will not go to this labor, and if it is to be done we must do it ourselves. In the movement towards the Church in England so much attention has been drawn to the ancient Catholic language and usages that dictionaries have been prepared. Works like Shipley's *Glossary of Ecclesiastical Terms*, though containing much that is fair, have too many blemishes to be accepted as a whole; yet unless Catholics take steps to produce something better, these works will be referred to as guides by our lexicographers and new difficulties will arise.

One difficulty arising from the action of these ritualists is the wholesale revival of obsolete and in many cases merely local terms, which they endeavor to bring into use, but which will probably all die out again in a few years as the movement, which attaches more importance to matters of custom and ceremony than to the essential points of religion, cannot possibly obtain permanent results.

Pugin, in his enthusiastic admiration of Gothic architecture, revived all the names connected with the Church and its fittings in the fifteenth century, and under the impulse of Early Text Societies everything is gleaned to give perfection to the revival of mediæval church furniture. The interior of some of their churches assume so Catholic a look that even priests entering them by mistake do not immediately discover their error. In fact we have heard of a case where a religious, belonging to an ancient and venerable order, having been invited to preach in a parish church, by mistake entered a ritualistic church. It was before the hour and there was nothing to disabuse him. Altar and tabernacle, candles and flowers, sanctuary lamp—all were there. He went up to the altar and passed into the sacristy. There was a stole, but he found it wonderfully long; the alb was there, but he saw no chasuble. He began to grow perplexed, and looked around for the missal. On

opening the books that were there he discovered that he was playing the interloper and retired unnoticed.

As a consequence of this revived mediævalism to which architects and designers contribute, words like *dossal* for hangings behind the altar, *orplurey* and similar terms are used very patly by those who attend ritualistic churches, and they suppose them all to be current among Catholics.

The subject is therefore to non-Catholics one of difficulty, and we can readily see how the efforts of the publishers of the later editions of Webster, who have shown every disposition to make their dictionary as clear in its definitions of Catholic terms as it is in defining those belonging to science, natural history, or commerce, have withal produced no better results. They have, too, attempted to fix the pronunciation of the proper names in our Catholic Bibles. The first essay due to one of our distinguished scholars may not in all cases be accepted, as there can scarcely be said to be established custom to fix the pronunciation of many words, and principles adopted in other cases may be questioned. Still it is a great step. Yet Webster's dictionary with all its admirable progress is, as we have seen, far from the standard. But we are inclined to think that if we on our side do something towards the preparation of a correct dictionary of Catholic terms our American lexicographers will gratefully adopt our definitions, and from the progress made we really hope far more at their hands than at those of lexicographers in England.

In view of the immense project undertaken on the other side, this ought not to be, but we fear that the greatest dictionary of the language ever projected will not, so far as we are concerned, be a very creditable performance, and we shall be most agreeably disappointed if our pessimist forecast proves fallacious.

The new English dictionary proposed by the Philological Society will, so far as we can judge, do nothing to remedy the various evils of which we complain. They propose to make it a complete inventory of our English tongue; but from the very scheme adopted the Catholic part will be done as wretchedly as ever. They began by dividing the time into three periods: 1. From the use of the language to the appearance of the first English version of the New Testament, 1526. 2. From 1526 to 1674. 3. From 1674 to the present time. For each of these periods a list of authors was made out, and members of the society and voluntary assistants were to examine them and extract passages giving the use of particular words. Of course the first period is Catholic, and many obsolete words will be found and given. How many Catholic works will be consulted in the second and third periods we have at the moment no means of telling; but beyond all doubt anti-Catholic literature

will be sifted, and terms of reproach, perverse interpretation of words, and the like, be gleaned to grace the pages.

In 1864 the secretary reported 176 works read in the first period, 622 in the second, 351 in the third, making 1149, with 360 more on hand.

That there are any Catholic collaborators we do not know ; but unless the Catholic part is made a special study the result will in that respect be a failure. The only plan seems to be for Catholics themselves to organize a similar work confined to the terms specially in use among us, and to interest as many as possible in this country, England, and Ireland to read through the Catholic authors from the earliest times, and give extracts showing the use of terms. We could thus gather obsolete words, show their meaning, their modern representatives, and examples attesting the latest period when they were in use ; words that have been in use from the earliest period and words that have been introduced to take the place of obsolete words. Terms revived by the ritualists which Catholics do not use need not be regarded ; but all nicknames applied to us should be collected, and characterized as being what they really are.

The preparation of such a dictionary of Catholic terms must be a labor of love ; but in view of the necessities of the case, there ought to be no difficulty in obtaining the necessary aid from those who have the honor of the Church at heart. If the Philological Society can secure hundreds to assist in carrying out its project, the far less comprehensive one proposed by us should be more cordially received as it directly concerns our holy mother the Church. If interest is awakened by drawing attention generally to the want there will be little difficulty in printing and publishing the result of the common labor.

In justice to others we are bound to take some steps to guide them aright, before we censure them too harshly for deviating from the correct path.

NOTES ON SPAIN.

NUMEROUS are the travellers from the United States that one meets with everywhere in Italy, and many agreeable reminiscences do I entertain of such acquaintances made there in the year of the Vatican Council. Few and far between, however, are the Americans to be found in Spain. This is a matter to be much regretted, for besides the advantage to the Spaniards of a much increased influx of visitors, transatlantic tourists would find in the more western peninsula a world of interest both in the land and also in its people, their ways, their looks, their monuments. One cannot at first but wonder that representatives of the nation of Prescott and Washington Irving are not more frequently to be found in the courts of the Alhambra, at the tomb of Ferdinand and Isabella, or amidst scenes of the lives of Columbus and Pizarro. Catholic citizens of the United States might, one would think, be greatly attracted towards a land so long, so emphatically Catholic, and still so profoundly permeated by Catholic sentiment. The bad repute, however, of Spanish living, Spanish inns, and Spanish travelling, a repute which keeps away so many English tourists, no doubt sufficiently accounts for the rarity there of our transatlantic cousins. It is, therefore, with much pleasure that I hasten to declare to the American public that a visit to Spain, just accomplished, convinces me that that land is most unjustly maligned, and to assure all interested in the question that lodging, feeding, and travelling can be effected with very reasonable comfort, and that all the points of special interest can be visited without hardship or fatigue.

Tastes proverbially differ; but for my part I must avow that comparing the towns and cities on the Spanish railways with analogous towns and cities on the German railways, I give the preference as regards cooking and sleeping accommodations very decidedly to Spain.

In five weeks spent there journeying from St. Sebastian to Barcelona, via Madrid, Cordova, Seville, Cadiz, Malaga, Grenada, and Valencia, I never met with a bed that was not both comfortable and scrupulously clean, and free from unwelcome tenants. Everywhere there is most excellent bread, and either good coffee, or good chocolate. Very rarely did the flavor of garlic (a flavor, by the way, without which there is no good cookery) obtrude itself, and the fault to be found was not with the cooking, but with the too prevalent habit of dressing meat too fresh—one of the many instances in which Spaniards carry their summer habits into the winter. If, however, there is this drawback as to their meat,

their sweets and confectionery are excellent. All the hotels are very reasonable in their charges, it being, however, advisable always on arrival to make a distinct agreement for so much a day, everything included.

Travelling by rail is slow work certainly, but the carriages are comfortable; and a non-smoking carriage is always to be had for the asking, and is strictly reserved for non-smokers. This is a far preferable arrangement to that of France, where smoking is nominally forbidden in every carriage and practically allowed in all, the onus of prohibition being thrown upon the travellers themselves, whose objection to smoking may be great, but whose moral courage for objecting may be small—to their serious inconvenience.

The ill repute as to travelling comfort from which Spain suffers was doubtless formerly well deserved, and that even not long ago. To be sure of this it is sufficient to read Lady Herbert, of Lea's, narrative of her journeys to Cordova and Grenada, and to compare them with my own experience. Spain is, in fact, a country but freshly opened up to travellers who are somewhat enterprising, who like to take a route not followed by the whole mob of tourists, but who yet care for creature comforts and do not care to "rough it." To such travellers I do not hesitate to say, go at once and judge for yourselves.

With these hints for the general public—which I trust may serve to encourage not a few hesitating tourists to venture on the southern side of the Pyrenees—I turn at once to matters concerning the Church and religion in Spain. That country is full of interest historically, politically, commercially, and scientifically. Its botany may be said to be yet unknown, while its flora is a far richer one than that of Italy. Even in zoology a great deal remains to be accomplished. To the Catholic, however, the word "Spain," calls up at once a host of ecclesiastical memories and aspirations, and upon the Catholic American that old country has very special claims.

A quick run from Paris to Bayonne, a night's rest at each, with a peep at Biarritz having been experienced, we (myself and a friend) crossed the Bidassoa and arrived at St. Sebastian in good time to ascend Monte Argullo, and enjoy the magnificent view from the ramparts of the fortress on its summit.

But just over the border we hardly hoped to find what we did find, so sudden a change in the aspect of things around us. Groups of ladies with mantillas, Spanish peasant dresses, and ox-drawn carts, the wheels of which were solid like those of classical Italy two thousand years ago.

The churches of St. Sebastian would be insignificant in another Spanish city. But in this, the first town visited, they were most

interesting, so strikingly different are they from those of France. With small windows to keep out heat and glare in a land of such penetrating sunshine, the wall-space left has encouraged the development of internal sculpture; and hence those enormous carved altar-pieces or "retablos," reaching to the ceiling, which are at once so general and so characteristic. The ornate and busy character of a Spanish church interior is what, together with the semi-obscurity, at first strikes the northern visitor. Profuse carving and gilding, the lavish character of which is generally more remarkable than the beauty, are apparent on every hand. But how and where to pray may trouble some newcomers. In St. Sebastian (so near France), as in one or two churches in Madrid, chairs like those in French churches are to be found. Generally, however, there is nothing but the pavement on which to kneel or sit—no bench or chair is to be seen. Another peculiarity is the position of the choir. Instead of being in close proximity to the altar—in front of it (as generally north of the Alps) or behind it, as so often in Italy—the choir with its stalls and organ is removed far from the sanctuary and is placed near the west end of the church. A narrow pathway (railed in on each side) connects, in most cathedrals, the inclosure of the choir with the distant sanctuary and allows the clergy to pass from one to the other without being inconvenienced by the congregation, which may crowd the interspace between these inclosures, standing or kneeling with their backs to the clergy and their faces to the altar.

In many parish and monastic churches the choir is raised up upon a great west gallery, the entire area of the church being thus left to the congregation. This we found to be the case with the large church at St. Sebastian, a very handsome flight of steps leading up on one side from the floor of the church to the choir. Close to this church, on the way up to the fortress, is a large Carmelite nunnery; and the next day (October 15th) was the feast of their patron, the great Spanish saint, St. Theresa. In the fortress itself we found a well-kept little chapel, with its lamp burning and the holy water stoop outside well filled. We felt we were in a Spanish rather than in a French fort.

Descending by the graves of the English officers who fell here in the Peninsular War, and passing the modern ruins of the adjacent stations and the cross set up by Ferdinand VII., in gratitude for his return, we went to the hotel for dinner and rest, in preparation for an early start next day for Burgos. Let the traveller then follow the same route, do as we did, and traverse it by day to enjoy its fine scenery, especially the magnificent defile of Pancorbo, with its limestone precipices—still better seen by railway than by the old coach-road.

The ancient and decayed city of Burgos and its environs contains three special objects of attraction,—its far-famed Cathedral, the Convent of Las Huelgas, and the Catuja, an old Carthusian monastery of Miraflores. Interesting as is this city to the artist and archaeologist, it was the worst for comfort we anywhere experienced on our route. At our hotel there, the *Rafaela*,—which, like so many Spanish inns, begins on the first floor, not on the ground floor,—we met with the only really unsavory dish, one made of odds and ends of ox, and with a taste resembling the odor of the cat. However, if the material gratifications of Burgos are scant and poor, a plentiful intellectual repast is offered there to the Catholic, the artist and the historian.

I entered the famed Cathedral at six in the morning, and found small scattered congregations at the different Masses which were going on in continual succession. The Spanish chasuble is like the Roman in that there is no cross behind, but it is longer and gradually widens from the shoulders downwards. The servers at these early masses were not clad in cassocks and surplices, but were poor boys in their own more or less ragged attire. Here, as elsewhere in Spain save Andalusia, I was struck with the gravity and solemnity with which Mass was said. The bell is always rung before the *pater noster*, as in France, and the congregation make then the sign of the cross in the complex way in which it is made in Spain,—the forehead, mouth, and chest being first crossed, then a large sign of the cross following, to which other small crossings may again succeed; the thumb being always kissed at the last.

Some forty clergy are attached to the Cathedral, of whom twenty-eight, I believe, are canons. The canons do not generally in Spain dress as in France or Italy, but each wears a long silk cloak (like a cope) with a colored hood over it, worn on the shoulders with a point extending down the back.

There are three High Masses in the Cathedral every day, and the office is, of course, daily sung—but not well sung. Hardly any congregation attends any part of it, even vespers. At that office, two priests in copes bearing silver maces (carried sloping over the shoulders) go from the sacristy through the sanctuary to the choir, and conduct thence three other priests in copes to the sanctuary, when, the altar having been incensed, they return to the choir. It is no part of the object of this paper to describe buildings already copiously described in guide-books, accordingly I will say nothing of the Cathedral, except to remark that for travellers from countries, such as England and France, the monuments of which have suffered so much from violence of iconoclasts, the uninjured and undefaced condition of its sculptured richness has a special charm.

At the old and magnificent Carthusian Monastery of Miraflores

there are now only three priests, survivors of its former monastic population. Forbidden to wear the habit, and unable to practice their rule, yet living in the building once a noted monastery of their order, their life must be a sad one save for interior consolations. They hope, however, that the change for the better, which has of late taken place in Spanish affairs, may soon permit them once more to receive novices and resume the monastic life now interrupted for what will soon be half a century. This hope is strengthened by the knowledge that every here and there over Spain the various monastic brotherhoods are beginning to reappear. At Burgos itself the dissolved Carmelite friars, the old "White Friars" of London, are once more in possession of their old church near the railway station, and are already a numerous community. Very pleasant was it to sit there and listen to their voices reciting vespers in the large western gallery, which is the choir of their church.

The Cistercian Convent of Las Huelgas is a case of ecclesiastical survival, for the abbess still holds sway over a subject village near the church, and though despoiled of her old wealth and no longer ranking as a princess palatine, second only to the queen, and no longer possessing legal jurisdiction (which formerly extended to the power of inflicting capital punishment), she is still styled Abbess "by the grace of God."

The nuns are easily to be seen when at their "office," since their "choir" occupies the whole nave of the church, with a grating at its eastern end through which they can see the altar. Visitors admitted at the transept can look back through the same grating at the nuns, and very stately dames are they, and majestically do they courtesy (not genuflect) to the altar as they pass out at the end of their service.

I paid a pleasant visit to the elderly Archbishop of Burgos, who still inhabits the ancient archiepiscopal palace adjoining the Cathedral. A conversation with him and with his secretary convinced me that no very hopeful view was taken by them of the politico-religious future of Spain. With much esteem for the well-intentioned young sovereign, King Alfonso, came the exclamations, "What can he do?" "A Constitutional King!" "He is helpless!" exclamations which seemed to me to point to possible Carlist proclivities.

After one night and day at Burgos the next city visited was Valladolid, interesting to every English and English-speaking Catholic from its Scotch and English colleges. The rector of the latter college (Dr. Allen) received us with great kindness, and courteously gave us for escort about the city a pleasant cicerone in the person of a student (Mr. Kennedy), who had already been seven years away from his friends, and who had three more summers to

grill in, in a city in which the sun of the 17th of October was quite as hot as could be endured with equanimity by an Englishman. This college was founded three hundred years ago, yet the building is not more than half that antiquity, and its church is a sort of rotunda with altars all round, their retablos profusely gilt in the Spanish style.

The Cathedral of Valladolid, though but a portion of the building which was planned, is very impressive in its massive solidity and majestic simplicity. Were it finished it might serve by comparison with Burgos as a test of the suitability for church purposes of the classical and Gothic styles. I take it that many a "Goth" going to Spain to admire pointed architecture, might end by giving the preference to its rival. Certainly before deciding, the cathedrals of Valladolid, Cadiz, and Grenada ought to be studied and "worked in." I mean really used by the observer again and again for private devotion as well as for assisting at public functions. Signs of religious life are not wanting in Valladolid. Thus the fine old Church of San Pablo has quite recently been restored, and Mass is said in it by the Jesuits, who have found their way here not as a regular community but as a few isolated individuals. It is also in contemplation to restore the much finer old Benedictine Church of San Gregorio.

After passing two days in this modern-looking city (modern on account of war's destructiveness), the capital of Spain when Philip II. was King, the old city of Avila demanded a careful visit. Avila is one of the holy cities of Spain, as being so much identified with that great and emphatically Spanish saint, St. Teresa. If Valladolid has been forced to put on a modern aspect it is far otherwise with Avila. Still begirt with its old mediæval battlemented walls with their very numerous towers, of which the east end of the Cathedral (actually built into the city walls) forms one, Avila is indeed a city of the past. It is a fossil, or rather an instance of survival, which no traveller, and certainly no American traveller (who generally so keenly appreciates the relics of the historic past), should on any account omit to visit; and his visit will not be an uncomfortable one. The small hotel (the *Fonda del Ingles*), conveniently situated just opposite the west door of the Cathedral, affords a clean and comfortable lodging and good and well-cooked food, all at exceedingly moderate charges.

The Cathedral, though small, is one of the most impressive in Spain. Early and severe in style, and built of a peculiar dark-colored stone, its rather small windows contain so much stained glass that even the bright sun of Spain sends but a dim religious light into its interior. A peculiar charm is imparted to the eastern portico of the church by the series of very slender columns which

intervene between the main columns supporting the clerestory and the lateral chapels.

In harmony with the charm of the church was the courtesy of its clergy, judged by the first one (a canon) who happened to be addressed, and who in reply to a request to hear a confession readily offered to a stranger and a foreigner either the present time or any subsequent hour of the afternoon or evening for that purpose.

The next morning was the Sunday within the octave of the feast of St. Teresa,—patron of Avila,—and a grand “funcion” at the expense of the ayuntamiento (or municipality) was to be held in the Carmelite Church. In and around Avila are various churches and convents connected with the life of the great saint.

At early Mass at the Cathedral, holy communion was given at the small altar in the middle of the wall of the apse. There was no rail or communion cloth, but the scanty communicants ascended a few narrow steps at one end of the chapel and knelt close to the altar, a small, square, stiff linen cloth being passed from hand to hand, and there was absolutely nothing but the stones of the pavement on which either preparation or thanksgiving could be made. The shape of the Spanish chasuble has already been mentioned. The maniple differs much not only from that of France but also from the Roman maniple, being less expanded at its free end than in the latter, and therefore more like the Gothic or mediæval maniple.

The tunics and dalmatics are as in France, with no sleeves, but merely flaps hanging over the arms, but very often, as at Avila, there is a prominent standing collar. These vestments are often worn by the serving lads at grand festivals.

The surplices are curiously and not nicely modified. The sleeves are narrow and long, but the arms do not traverse them, but, passing through armholes, the sleeves hang loose, save that they are carried by the wearer (server, preacher, or other) twisted around the arm. The surplices are also very much cut down the back at the neck, and at the same time are deeply notched below, so that the two sides are united over the back only by a narrow isthmus of linen.

The boys who serve Mass commonly aid the priest in putting up the chalice, etc., after Mass, holding open the bursa to receive the Corporal. They do the same at Bayonne. The hour for the function having arrived, we repaired to the Church of Nuestra Serafica Madre Santa Teresa de Jesus, which was adorned with hangings and lit up with many candles. There were some seats in the nave, near the altar, for the municipality, and one bench, extending almost the whole length, on each side of the nave, where, luckily

for un-Spanish knees, we got seats. The High Mass, at a side altar (said by tonsured Carmelite Fathers), was just concluding.

Soon, however (the church meanwhile rapidly filling), the strains of a military band were heard approaching, the great west doors were thrown open, and in marched the ayuntamiento in evening dress, preceded by alguazils and another most mediæval-looking official. The band remained outside and ceased playing. The priest, deacon, and sub-deacon (Carmelite Fathers) then advanced to the altar, and High Mass began before the Blessed Sacrament exposed.

Meanwhile the whole centre of the nave had become covered by kneeling women, the men standing or kneeling in the side aisles and at the west end. It is very curious to see the women of all classes so much alike. All in black, with black veils over their heads, it requires a female eye to distinguish, in many cases, rich from poor. This is one of the various pleasing and edifying instances of a *good* equality which exists in Spain, and all fine dressing for church and vain rivalry as to fashion in God's house is here utterly unknown. The women have a curious way of resting themselves, after long kneeling, by sitting back on their own heels, when they seem as comfortable as if on chairs, although the legs must continue sharply flexed the whole time, and would be painfully cramped but for long practice from childhood. It was odd to see them on this occasion, when there was a long service and sermon, alternately kneeling up and sitting back on themselves, but never rising from the ground at all, and fanning themselves more or less the whole time. The municipality and all the men behaved very well, standing during the greater part of the time, but kneeling at the more solemn parts of the service. The sermon was long, extempore,—at least spoken with animation, not read,—and eloquent, the words being also pronounced very distinctly. St. Teresa, the pride of Spain, the special glory of Avila, was, of course, its subject. A life-sized image of the saint, dressed in a real habit and surrounded with gilt rays like a sun, stood on the Gospel side of the altar, and, at intervals, the preacher turned towards it and, extending his arms, exclaimed in an impassioned manner, “Oh, Madre Nuestra! Oh, santa mia! Oh, Santa de Avila!”

The High Mass being concluded, the three Carmelite priests, with their attendants, and preceded by the municipality, came forth, bearing the relics of the saint—her rosary, a shoe, her walking-staff, and one of her fingers in a crystal reliquary. The crowd fell back on each side in the plaza, and stood uncovered while the clergy passed out for about a hundred yards and then returned.

Avila is a very Catholic city, and edifying in many ways, but,

nevertheless, all the shops were open on Sunday, and this we found to be the case in Spain generally.

A visit was then paid to the great Dominican Monastery of Santo Tomas, wherein, including novices, there are now about one hundred friars. It is thus devoted to its original destination, having been founded for Dominicans by Ferdinand and Isabella. The friars were expelled with the rest in 1831, but some years afterwards the ex-Queen Isabella II. bought it and restored it to them. The reader may wonder how a large monastery such as this should have escaped destruction during the recent revolution. The reason is not any goodwill on the part of the "Liberals" (save the mark!), but because friars are found to be actually necessary animals for the government of the Philippine Islands, and so the said Liberals are reluctantly compelled to tolerate various flourishing monasteries destined to furnish the much-needed religious, who, from their destination, are known as "Filippinos," whatever the Order to which they may belong.

The prior spoke English well, having resided at Hong Kong. His monastery is magnificent, with its stately cloisters and the beautiful carved work of the stalls of the choir. This choir is placed high up in a western gallery, and, by a very singular exception, the high altar is also placed high up on another similar gallery situated at the eastern end of the church.

On the floor of the church, in front of the high altar, is placed the beautiful white marble tomb of Prince Juan, the only son of Ferdinand and Isabella, who died a promising youth of nineteen. High up on one side of the church is a small gallery, into which his parents would occasionally come, and from which the tomb and high altar can be equally well seen.

Sunset, from the Alameda of Avila, is a lovely sight, and great is the change in temperature to be perceived immediately after it has taken place. Thin and biting is the air; but is it wonderful that it should be so when it is remembered that Avila, though in the midst of a wide, undulating plain, is as high as the top of Snowdon?

The start from Avila for the Escorial required a rise at four A.M., by which we were enabled to reach the palace about eight. That palace, its rooms for royal residence in life; its resting-places for royalty in death; its church, sacristy, library, garden, monastic buildings, etc., need no description here, for they are all fully described in guide-books. But a few words may be said as to the impressions made upon travellers arriving freshly from mediæval Avila and passing, with minds saturated with the charms of its old Cathedral, into the great temple in the Escorial. In spite of the impressive solemnity, the mysterious sanctity, and chaste beauty of

the former, it was impossible not to be struck with the majesty, lofty sublimity, and noble simplicity of the latter. Lovers of Gothic as we were, we felt that here in this classical church, we were in a temple as worthy to enshrine the worship of the being of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness, and of inconceivable majesty, as was the pure and simple Gothic church of Avila or the stately and richly-ornate Cathedral of Burgos. Curious, also, was it to recollect how rapid was the change which came upon the architecture of the land—curious that a church so thoroughly and completely classical as that of the Escorial should have been designed while in other places Gothic architecture was still in continued use.

But however impressive and elevating may be the effect of the Escorial's church, no one can deny but that, whether as palace or as monastery, the residential building is vastly inferior to earlier—and, indeed, to later—structures, though, on account of its mass, its effect, as a whole, has a certain undeniable grandeur.

The journey to Madrid, of twenty-one miles, was accomplished in less than two hours and a half! and travellers are landed at a station sufficiently remote from the city to necessitate a long drive over a road so bad that the jolting endured must be felt before it can be imagined. Landed, at a hotel in the *Puerta del Sol*,—a gay, open space from which the best streets radiate,—much-needed repose was at last gained. There is little to detain or interest the lover of architecture in Madrid, but the ordinary traveller may be (as we were) agreeably surprised to find Madrid so Spanish after all that one has heard of the influx of French customs. The picture-gallery, with its most interesting portraits by Velasquez, to say nothing of Murillo, and the wonderfully rich collection of arms and armor in the *Armeria*, should both be visited with care and by no means in haste. The opera-house and theatres deserve a visit, and the curious in Spanish manners may go to a small, cheap play-house, No. 7 in the *Calle Barquillo*, for music and dancing, which made the writer, when he first witnessed it, exclaim: "Am I in Madrid or in Morocco?"

The churches in Madrid are comparatively uninteresting, and especially so is the celebrated sanctuary, the Church of the *Atocha*, the only handsome object in which is the magnificent tomb of the unhappy revolutionist, Prim, on which his effigy lies recumbent as in mediæval monuments, but not in the attitude of prayer. The old Jesuit church, *San Isidro el Real*, is handsome in its way, as are various other Madrid churches, which deserve no special mention. The fashionable church is in the *Calle de Alcalá*, the first church on the left after leaving the *Puerta del Sol*. Here there are plenty of chairs and a crowded congregation, but here, as in every other church in Spain, the ladies still wear their black veils, French bon-

nets being reserved for worldly use, and especially for the afternoon promenade. Never have I seen Mass said with more earnestness and devotion than by the worthy parish priest of this fashionable church.

In need of temporal and spiritual aids, visits had to be paid before leaving Madrid to a Spanish banker and to Cardinal Moreno. Spanish bankers have the curious habit of giving you no indication of their whereabouts. Not only is no name to be found at the gate of the house, but they do not even put their names outside their own door, which opens on the staircase, so that you have actually to ferret them out as you might rabbits, as if the one thing they wished to avoid was to "do business." The proper door having at last been found, entrance was, at half past ten, obtained into a room in which a group of clerks were discussing newspapers and cigarettes with much ease and leisure. Business we were told began at eleven.

Having ascertained that the Archbishop of Toledo had come to Madrid for the winter the writer drove to his palace, in the Calle del Sacramento, and adjoining the Church of San Justo. Ascending a large staircase a door on the first floor admitted the visitor into a dark room or outer hall, where he was met by a priest who courteously inquired his purpose in coming. The visitor saying he was provided with a special letter of introduction from the Cardinal Manning he was ushered through a room on the left, in which were persons of both sexes awaiting an audience, with two or three priests walking up and down in their midst, arranging the order of admission and other details. This room led to a third, much larger, furnished with red velvet chairs and sofa, and with a crimson and gold throne and canopy at one end, two oil paintings of the Pope and King being placed side by side beneath the canopy and behind and above the throne. After waiting some twenty minutes His Eminence appeared at a further door and beckoned with his finger. The visitor advanced, paid his reverence, and was led by the Cardinal through another rather handsomely furnished drawing-room into a small cabinet, with two tables covered with books and writings, and a sofa on which he was invited to sit down beside the Cardinal Moreno, Archbishop of Toledo and Primate of Spain. He could not speak French, but chatted pleasantly in Spanish, not by any means hurrying his visitor. His view of Spanish affairs and of the prospects of religion was cheerful, and after a pleasant interview he courteously accompanied his visitor half way through the first drawing-room, at the door of which parting bows were exchanged.

Having seen the Archbishop of Toledo the next thing was to see his city and church, so interesting not only on account of its

beauty and renown, but as the only spot in Spain in which the Mozarabic rite is still in daily use in one of its many chapels. Accordingly leaving Madrid about seven we reached Toledo (by the new direct line) about ten, and went to the Fonda de Lino, a hotel where it is well to make a distinct bargain, and where it is not easy to make a cheap one.

Toledo is a wonderful city. Though conquered from the Moors as early as 1085 it is a Moorish city still. It is a chaos of houses divided by a multitude of narrow tortuous lanes, in utter irregularity and devoid of any general direction, as if they were the gaps left by builders who must have some way of retreat from houses which they had constructed each for itself, and without regard to its neighbors or any general plan. The city moreover is perched on a lofty hill, a natural fortress with a natural moat, for the river Tagus flows round the greater part of its circumference. Then the streets are not only narrow and tortuous, but also steep, and curious indeed is the effect on the traveller who arrives in the dark in an omnibus drawn by a crowd of mules, which were fully needed to drag the heavy vehicle up the steep incline and through lanes in which it seemed hardly able to avoid the house-walls, and finally into the door of a house and a yard, from which a staircase leads to the entrance to the inn, which begins as usual only on the first floor.

Toledo is undoubtedly one of the most interesting cities in Spain for the artist, the historian, and the Catholic. Here are to be found evidences of every great transition which the country has undergone. Without its walls are remains of a Roman amphitheatre and circus maximus. Of the Visigothic civilization and the high perfection to which its arts attained we have evidence in the beautiful gold votive crowns found in the vicinity, and now preserved in the Armeria, at Madrid, and the Hotel de Cluny, at Paris. The Saracenic period has here left deeper traces than anywhere else in Spain, except at Cordova, Grenada, and Seville. The early and late mediæval periods are well exemplified, while Renaissance work everywhere shows itself, and modern revolutionary destruction and decay have, alas, left but too sad and unmistakable traces of their operation. In another manner also the changes of ideas and manners are well exemplified. The religious sentiment of the time of the Visigoths (as shown by its worship) is preserved in the venerable Mozarabic rite, which is still daily performed in the Cathedral, and annually in various Toledan churches. The many traces of Moorish skill in construction and decoration, exemplified in the two fine mediæval synagogues, not only testify to the coexistence of Mohammedan and Jewish believers, but to the wise and equitable toleration of the Spanish Christians in the earlier part of the Middle Ages. It was this spirit of equity which led King Alonzo VI.

to refuse his sanction to the conversion of the great mosque into a church till the Moors themselves had consented to the act. The spirit of intolerance which subsequently became so sadly characteristic of the nation has left its mark in the Christian emblems in the synagogues, which emblems mark their confiscation, and commemorate the period of the expulsion of the Moors and Jews. These intolerant acts not only violated equity and greatly impaired material prosperity, but religion itself suffered, for a religious decay soon began to show itself as a sequence if not a consequence of the régime of excessive repression. To that régime succeeded revolution and irreligion, of which only too abundant traces are to be found, and amongst them the present desecrated state of the two sometime churches and ancient synagogues of Toledo. Finally the last phase of national life, the reviving spirit of religion, is showing itself in the work now going on to restore Christian worship in the old Jewish building, where, if no untoward event occurs, Mass will be once more said, and this time without the accompaniment of persecution or injustice to any one.

Singularly desolate and forlorn is the old Jewish quarter of Toledo, and decay is also the prevailing aspect of the city as seen from the exterior, with its crumbling walls and ruined buildings, the result in great part of the suppression of the monasteries.

The two synagogues to which reference has just been made, are called *El Transito* and *Santa Maria la Blanca*, respectively. Both are very interesting works erected by Moorish workmen for the Jews. The latter building was founded in the twelfth century and the former in 1366, so that for more than three hundred years the Jews enjoyed generous toleration.

Not far off is the magnificent Franciscan Convent and Church of San Juan de los Reges, founded by Ferdinand and Isabella. The cloister is perhaps the most elaborate and ornate example of Gothic architecture which exists, and it is open to question whether its luxuriant magnificence altogether harmonizes with the severe and austere monastic reform professed by the friars who were its first inhabitants.

Its church is also open to criticism. Questionable was the taste which ornamented its exterior with the chains said to have been worn by the Christian captives at Grenada.

Within the church the profuse decorative sculpture exemplifies that decay of piety and increase of worldliness characteristic of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. In it, as generally in the churches of that period, and notably in the interior of the magnificent chapel of King's College, Cambridge, we see the images of the saints and holy emblems dwarfed and diminished, while heraldic figures, crests,

and supporters became enormous, and huge coats of arms, crowns, and coronets obtrude themselves on all sides.

But the temple of Toledo is, of course, its famed Cathedral, interesting as the primatial church of Spain, as the one example of pure Northern Gothic in the old Spanish capital, and from its intrinsic beauty and vast size. Its length is not great,—less by more than a hundred feet than the length of Westminster Abbey,—but its width is much more than twice that of its London rival. Its beauty is mainly due to the charm of the originally constructed pure pointed church, but in part to the multiplicity and richness of later additions, which, though less profuse and ornate than those of Burgos, are equally well preserved and free from mutilation.

It happened that the first introduction of the writer to the Cathedral's interior was by the door of the north transept, from which an uninterrupted view is at once obtained of the whole breadth of the transepts and of the circling aisle with its clustered columns extending round behind the high altar. Turning to the left the comparatively modern chapel de la Virgen del Segario at once arrested the attention. This chapel has a very striking effect, for there is first a sort of antechapel, then the shrine of the much-venerated Virgin of Toledo, with the richly decorated sacred image above the altar. Beyond this is a large chapel containing relics, the golden reliquaries of which are visible in the distance behind and above the Virgin's altar, which thus stands between a dark and sombre antechapel and the large, brilliant sanctuary of relics, which seems a mysterious Holy of Holies but partially visible. Around the sanctuary of the high altar are beautiful sculptures, which have been partially removed to the Gospel side to make way for the Renaissance tomb of a bishop. Behind the altar is the lofty and elaborately carved, painted and gilt retablo, and the great pillars on the east side of the entrance to the sanctuary, which are elaborately decorated with niches and statuary. The choir is not so near the west end of the church as in many Spanish cathedrals, and this, together with double aisles all round, gives great spaciousness to the nave. Beneath the southern towers at the west end is the Mozarabic Chapel. The great charm of this magnificent Cathedral is its splendid old stained glass, with which almost every window is entirely filled.

The 25th of October being the feast of the dedication of the church there was a grand High Mass, solemn procession, and sermon. There are between forty and fifty clergy attached to the Cathedral. In the old days there were nearly a hundred canons and prebendaries, amongst which were reckoned the Pope and the King, each of whom was fined two thousand maravedis for non-attendance in choir at Christmas-tide. In the procession there

were thirty-six priests in white copes and three in dalmatics, carrying relics. The processional cross here, as in some other parts of Spain (*e. g.*, at Cadiz), has at the upper part of its staff a wooden cylinder covered with an embroidered veil so arranged as to form a conical roof above it, the whole being placed just below the cross.

At High Mass a few men knelt or sat within the screen of the sanctuary, and the Epistle and Gospel were sung near but not from two gilt metal pulpits placed one on each side of the metal screen.

The sermon was long, and the preacher complained bitterly of the coldness and indifference which must exist when on such a day only a few dozen persons (and there were really no more) could be found present at the festal service. The music was moderately good, but it seemed to us that in Spain both church organs and military bands had become affected by the prevailing twang of the guitar.

The matter of most interest to the present writer however was the old Mozarabic rite, the performance of which he carefully attended, having been provided by the civil sacristan with the office book and missal of the rite. For it is not only the Mass which is peculiar but the office also; and in the Mozarabic Chapel there is a choir with regular stalls, wherein the Mozarabic office is duly chanted daily. It is chanted very quickly and also indistinctly, so that it was a matter of some difficulty to follow the words.

The office began with Prime, of which the first words said audibly are: "In nomine Domini nostri Jesu Christi lumen cum pace." After four Psalms and a number of versicles and responses, there followed a lesson from the Old Testament and one from the Epistles and a hymn; and then, strange to say, the *Gloria in excelsis*, followed by the Nicene Creed. In the creed there are certain differences from the creed in the Roman rite. Thus instead of "genitum non factum consubstantialem patri," there is "natum non factum, Homousion Patri; hoc est ejusdem cum Patre substantiæ." Also instead of "et crucifixus est," there is only "passus sub Pontio Pilato."

Next comes the Lord's Prayer, which is said in the following peculiar and very impressive mode:

Priest. Pater noster qui es in cœlis.

Choir. Amen.

P. Sanctificetur nomen tuum.

C. Amen.

P. Adveniat regnum tuum.

C. Amen.

P. Fiat voluntas tua sicut in cœlo et in terra.

C. Amen.

P. Panem nostrum quotidianum da nobis hodie.

C. Quia Deus es.

P. Et dimitte nobis debita nostra sicut et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris.

C. Amen.

P. Et ne nos inducas in tentationem.

C. Sed libera nos a malo.

Finally comes an elaborate benediction in four parts, given by the priest standing, the choir all kneeling and replying Amen to each part.

Tierce then begins with the *Venite exultemus Domino*, followed by Psalms, two little chapters (one from the Old and the other from the New Testament), a hymn, the Lord's Prayer (as before), and an elaborate benediction. *Sext* and *None* are constructed similarly to *Tierce*.

The Mass is believed to be almost purely the ancient Mass of the Gothic times before the advent of the Moors, but a few additions and alterations are known to have been made in the time of Cardinal Ximenes; and doubtless the influence of the Toledo rite, introduced in the eleventh century, must have made itself felt. Neither in the altar nor in the vestments is there anything at present peculiar.

As in the Dominican rite, so here, the priest puts the wine and water in the chalice, and spreads the corporal before the Introit. There is no Kyrie, but the Gloria is said, and then a lesson from the Old Testament, followed by the Epistle and Gospel, as in the Ambrosian rite at Milan. After the offertory and incensing, the priest turns round to receive the offerings of the people saying: "Centuplum accipias, et vitam æternam possideas in Regno Dei. Amen. A special blessing is then given to the bread, with which ceremony the blessing of the bread at the French High Mass has probably some connection. With this ceremony the Mass of the Catechumen ends. At the beginning of the *Missa fidelium* the priest (after a short prayer) raises his hands and says: "Oremus," to which the choir respond, "Agyos, Agyos, Agyos, Domine Deus Rex Æterne, tibi laudes et gratias."

The priest then prays for the Catholic Church, and commemorates the blessed Virgin, the Apostles and Evangelists, and many saints, and afterwards begins the preface by placing his hands on the chalice and saying:

Priest. Aures ad Dominum.

Choir. Habemus ad Dominum.

P. Sursum Corda.

C. Levemus ad Dominum.

P. Deo ac Domino nostro Jesu Christo Filio Dei, qui est in cœlis, dignas laudes dignasque gratias referamus.

C. Dignum et justum est.

Then follows a preface different from the Roman ones, and after it a Sanctus is sung, at the end of which occur the words: "Agyos, Agyos, Agyos, Kyrie O Theos." The rest of the Mass before the consecration is exceedingly short, and the words of consecration of the Gothic Mass are different from those of the Roman. The last words (of those which immediately follow the actual words of consecration) are said aloud; the choir responding, Amen.

The consecrating words of the old rite are: "*Hoc est corpus meum quod pro vobis tradetur;*" and "*Hic est Calix novi testamenti in meo sanguini, qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum.*"

The chalice is elevated, not naked but covered with its veil.

Then after two short prayers there is another and very peculiar elevation, due doubtless to the former prevalence of the Arian heresy in Spain.

The priest holding the Host over the uncovered chalice says: "Fidem quam corde credimus, ore autem dicamus." He then elevates the Holy Sacrament that it may be seen by the people, and the creed is recited in the same words as at Prime, the separate clauses being said alternately.

The Host is then broken into nine pieces, disposed on the paten in a peculiar order, and the priest commemorates first the living and then the dead, and the choir sing as introductory to the communion the words: "Gustate et videte quam suavis est Dominus. Alleluia."

Having received both kinds and said two short prayers, the priest or the deacon says on the more solemn feasts: "Solemnia completa sunt in nomine Domini nostri Jesu Christi; votum nostrum sit acceptum cum pace." On less solemn days he says: "Missa acta est in nomine Domine nostri Jesu Christi perficamus cum pace."

This form is very interesting as giving the key to the enigmatical words of the Roman Mass, "Ite missa est."

Lastly, the priest gives the blessing, turning to the people (the only time he does it except at the offertory) and making the sign of the cross over them saying: "Pater et Filius." The unaccustomed hearer might well wonder (as the Frenchman, King Philip V., did wonder) how it is that the name of the Holy Spirit seems to be omitted. It is not, however, really so, for it occurs at the very beginning of the benediction before the priest turns round, so that it is not apt to be noticed. The full words of the blessing are: "In unitate Sancti Spiritus benedicat vos Pater et Filius."

There is yet another notable peculiarity in the Mozarabic rite. The Gloria Patri does not form two verses as with us, but the whole is said in one verse, as follows:

“Gloria et honor Patri et
Filio et Spiritui Sancto in
Sæcula sæculorum. Amen.”

It has been thought that these observations may not be without interest to the Catholic American reader. The writer has not yet had time to jot down more, but hereafter hopes to add his notes, taken in the same spirit, respecting his visit to Cordova, Seville, Cadiz, Grenada, Malaga, Valencia, and Barcelona.

A QUESTION ON LAUGHTER.

THERE is something very attractive in a good hearty laugh. It is like a furtive sunbeam, peeping through the clouds of a sullen September equinoctial, or a bright, cosy fire in the sitting-room on washing-day, suggestive of the idea that not everything, after all, is wet, and dreary, and dismal, and comfortless in this lower world of ours. It brightens up a man's face, and smooths out the wrinkles of passion, and opens up unsuspected depths of good-humor and kindly feeling, until you wonder that the good points of your friend's character could have lain so long concealed from you. Yet, if we reflect upon it, it is not often that we hear a genuine, hearty, whole-souled laugh. Man's nature seems rather to be made for sorrow than for joy. Gladness is but a transient guest, and passes quickly; sorrow makes her abiding-place with us. Go into the streets of this busy city, for example, and scan the faces of the passers-by. How many care-worn, haggard countenances; how many faces bearing the stamp of anxiety, trouble, or even settled melancholy, will you find for one which shows the placid mien and clear bright eye of habitual cheerfulness. Laughter is all too rare in this world, and if there were more of it men would be better, both physically and morally—naturally and (though to some it may seem a bold assertion) supernaturally also.

This being the case, it is certainly somewhat discouraging to be told, as we are by certain pious and excellent books, that our divine Lord never once laughed during the course of His mortal

life. Now if these grave and reverend authors were to confine their assertion to the horse-laugh or guffaw, that rude and boisterous mirth which is the very stamp and seal of vulgarity, they would find in us an ardent supporter. To our taste nothing is more offensive than

“The loud laugh that speaks the vacant mind,”

and consequently nothing more foreign to the angel modesty of our Saviour. But the upholders of the tradition are not content with this. True, they will admit that our Lord's face habitually wore a smile; that grace and beauty clothed him as a garment; that the gentle serenity and ineffable peace depicted on His features formed a great element in that attraction which kept thousands spellbound at His side in the desert, forgetful even of food and drink; but that He laughed outright, they stoutly deny. Their opinion seems to be based upon the too rigid interpretation of some passages from the Fathers. St. Basil, for example, writes as follows:

“To break out into boisterous guffaws . . . is not the mark of one whose soul is composed, upright, and master of itself. . . . And our Lord Himself shows that this is true, because, while taking upon Himself other affections which necessarily accompany the body, and all those things which bear some relation to virtue, such as weariness and sympathy for the unfortunate, He never, so far as can be gathered from the history of the Gospels, indulged in laughter.”—*Lib. Reg. fus. disp. Interrogatio*, 17.

St. John Chrysostom, writing on sorrow for sin, speaks as follows:

“If you also weep in this manner, you are become an imitator of your Lord. For He wept both over Lazarus and over the city; and he was troubled for Judas's sake. Indeed we often find him weeping; nowhere do we find Him laughing—no, nor even smiling. Certainly nothing of this sort is narrated by any of the Evangelists.”—*Hom. in Matt.* vi.

St. Augustine speaks to the same effect:

“And, indeed, we read that the Lord Jesus grieved, wept, was wearied with journeying; that He bore insults and injuries, and took upon Himself spittle, scourges, and the cross; but we do not read that He ever laughed or was prosperous on earth.”—*Sermon LXXXIII.*

It would seem, at first sight, that these passages confirm the idea that our Lord never laughed, but we think it will appear on closer examination that they give it nothing more than a purely negative support. The holy Fathers point out to us that the Gospel does not bring our Lord before us as laughing, and this is undoubtedly true. It was more necessary that our attention should be called to

His tears. They do not intend to infer from this that, in fact, He never laughed, nor could they in justice do so. "The Scriptures do not say that our Lord laughed; therefore He never did," is the argument put into the mouths of these Fathers by our opponents. They were too good logicians to overlook the fact that there is no evident reason why the converse of this argument should not have equal probability: "The Scriptures do not tell us that our Lord never laughed; therefore, it is probable that sometimes he did." In fact, the second argument would appear the more valid of the two, because that a man should never once laugh outright, during the whole course of his life, is certainly an extraordinary fact, and one which would well deserve mention had it occurred. Thus, we find it especially recorded as a remarkable trait of the stern old Roman, M. Crassus, that he laughed only once in his life, and gained thereby the surname of ἀγέλαστος.¹

There is only one case in which the former syllogism could be regarded as having weight; in the supposition, namely, that laughter in itself is something wrong or unbecoming a virtuous man. In such a supposition, we may readily conceive that had our Lord really laughed, the sacred writers would not have failed to notice the fact, and explain it. In any other case, it would be unnecessary to do so. Now, that laughter is in any degree wrong in itself, the sternest Calvinist would hardly venture to maintain. It only remains, therefore, to be seen whether there is in it anything essentially trivial, low, childish, or imperfect; anything, in short, which could render it in any way unbecoming the ineffable dignity of the God-man. Before answering this question, let us endeavor to obtain a clear idea of the nature and intrinsic characteristics of laughter.

To invent a rigorous definition in this matter is by no means an easy task. Cicero, in his *De Oratore*, thus confesses his unwillingness to undertake it:

"Quid sit risus, quo pacto concitetur, ubi sit, quomodo existat, atque ita repente erumpat ut eum cupientes retinere nequeamus, et quomodo simul latera, os, venas, vultum, oculos occupet, viderit Democritus."

It is not like Melancholy. She is a subjective, reflective, self-inspective being; she craves to be examined and brooded over; and the more closely we gaze upon her, the more defined does her shadowy form become, the more distinct her gloomy features, and the more oppressive that sad and solemn spell which she shakes from her dusky robes. It is not so with Mirth. He is a shy and

¹ Lucilius, cited by Cicero, de Finibus, cap. xxx.

capricious elf. He is with us, bright and airy, scattering roses on our path, wreathing our forehead with flowers, shedding the hues of morning from his roseate wings; but no sooner do we wish to scrutinize his laughing features, and subject the merry elf to a grave analysis, than, lo, he has vanished, and, like another Ariel, mingling with the elements, leaves us to paint his unsubstantial lineaments from memory alone. Relying, however, on certain grave authorities, we may perhaps say, with some approach to accuracy, that laughter is a peculiar movement of the muscles of the face, particularly of the lips, indicating merriment or satisfaction, and usually accompanied by some convulsion of the diaphragm, and a sonorous and interrupted expulsion of air from the lungs. It must also be observed that these effects are usually due to the felicitous association of objects or ideas which are not in themselves connected, or which, being in some way opposed to our ordinary observation and expectation, carry with them a pleasant surprise. That some sort of surprise or shock to our accustomed train of ideas is necessary to excite laughter, appears from the fact that even the most ludicrous events, when grown old by frequent repetition, have no longer their mirth-provoking power, and that even when they are presented to us for the first time, they are comparatively tame if we come upon them gradually. Thus every one knows that the faculty of "telling a good story" depends, in great measure, on the ability to keep the *dénouement* hidden until the proper moment, when all the circumstances, severally explained and understood, are suddenly brought into some incongruous and ridiculous juxtaposition, which by its very suddenness carries us completely by storm, and forms the *point*, or laughable part of the tale.

Laughter, therefore, implies two things—is formed of two elements: reason, which perceives the ridiculous in things, and certain organs which give expression to the pleasure arising therefrom. Hence it follows immediately that laughter is peculiar to man; that it is what the scholastics call a *proprium*. The brute cannot laugh. The ape may grin and chatter, and the parrot scream a clamorous ha! ha! ha! but the power of laughing is denied them; for though they are, in all probability, furnished with the necessary organs, the rational faculty is wanting, by which to compare ideas and perceive their mutual relations. The angel cannot laugh; for, although the intelligence with which he is endowed is far superior to our own, he lacks the material organs. It may even be questioned whether an angel could really laugh were he, by some miracle, to become possessed of an organized body; for being gifted with an intellect so vast and far-reaching, and seeing besides with one glance, in every principle of his knowledge, all

the conclusions to which it leads,¹ he could, in all probability, never come upon any relation of objects or ideas having, in his regard, that element of novelty and surprise which, as we have shown, seems to be essential to the ludicrous.²

We are now in a position to answer the question, Is there in laughter anything essentially low, trivial, or degrading, which would render it in itself unworthy our divine Lord's character, and thus make the mere fact that no mention is made in the Gospels of his having laughed a sufficient guarantee that he did not? Evidently, from what we have shown, there is nothing. Far from being derogatory to the dignity of man, laughter is an exercise of his noblest faculty, the godlike reason. It is one of his prerogatives.

"Smiles from reason flow, to brutes denied,"

sings the poet. It is this fact which makes us so impatient with those shallow characters who, through a motive of vanity or the mere love of buffoonery, continually assail us with threadbare puns and strained allusions, and by every trivial means lay siege to our risibilities. If it be repugnant to reason to exert any of our merely animal powers, to eat, sleep, walk, or run, without a sufficient object and motive for the action, how much more so when the act implies the use of our noblest faculty, the reason. The resentment, then, with which we regard these impertinent triflers, is an indication of the really high place which laughter holds in our estimation. Besides, we would remind those who think mirth unseemly and derogatory to the dignity of our Lord, that dignity does not consist precisely in *what* one does, but rather in *how* he does it. The most dignified person in the world must perform all the commonest actions of life, which appear so awkward in others; but he does them with a grace which ennobles them. So it was with the laugh of our Lord; it must have been soft and sweet as the evening breeze when it lingers and whispers and murmurs in the waving rushes, or sinks to sleep, dew-laden and heavy with perfume, on some odor-breathing violet-bed; it must have been musical and clear as a silver bell, and tinged withal with a certain gentle gravity and simple majesty, which made it not less godlike than his terrible anger or mysterious weeping. That our mirth is undignified is no sign that His was so.

Our divine Saviour, says St. Paul, was made like to us in all things except sin. The object of His life was twofold: first, to redeem us; secondly, to teach us by His example; or, rather, the

¹ St. Thomas, Sum. Th. P. I, Qu. 54, Art. 4 *et seq.*

² St. Bonaventure holds a similar opinion, though for another reason. See his In. Lib. Sent., l. 2, d. 8, p. 1, arg. 3, q. 2, ad arg.

object of His death was to redeem, while His life was intended as a model, that we might in all things be made conformable to Him. For this end it was not necessary that all His actions should be recorded. The Beloved Disciple himself says that were all, even of the most wonderful actions of our Lord, to be written, the whole world would scarcely contain the books. It sufficed that He should show His apostles and disciples, who were constantly observing and scrutinizing His life, how every thought, word, and action should be ordered, every impulse moderated, every passion controlled and directed, that they might afterwards know how to form themselves and others. We see, then, the propriety of His taking upon Himself all our thoughts and feelings, of His tasting joys and griefs like ours, of His sharing our weakness and our strength; in short, all that is ours except sin, and consequently our laughter as well as our tears.

Indeed, the very fact that our Lord wept is a probable proof that He laughed also. There is but a step from laughter to weeping. Both seem to affect the same muscles, though in different manners. This can easily be remarked in the little parlor ornaments which were quite popular a few years ago, one of which represents the head of a laughing child, while the companion-piece shows the same child crying.

Both actions are accompanied by a sort of convulsive action of the lungs, although the sobbing of grief, as befits a stronger passion, is more violent than that of mirth. Both, properly speaking, are peculiar to man; "crocodile tears," no less than a "horse-laugh," have only a metaphorical existence. Finally, both are possessed of that contagious influence which impels us to laugh with the laughing, and weep with those who weep.

"Ut ridentibus arident, ita flentibus adflent humani vultus."

All this shows that laughter and crying have their seat in the same organs. Take children, in whom the emotions of nature find their unrestricted course; how often does their laughter end in a sob, and who has not seen a rainbow smile break through the falling mist of their tears? It is this mysterious sympathy between the two extremes which gives so much truth to Scott's description of his Lady of the Lake, gazing from the strand after her departing knight,

"With a smile on her lip, and a tear in her eye."

There is a very sound scholastic maxim which has a bearing on this point: *Contraria sunt ejusdem potentie*. Objects which are directly contrary to one another pertain to the same faculty; as, for instance, black and white to the sense of vision, hard and soft

to that of touch, pleasure and pain to the sensitive appetite, etc. From this, as well as from the facts we have mentioned, it follows that laughter and weeping are only different acts of the same faculty, and that whatever reason may have existed for our Lord's weeping (outside of the immediate occasion, which in His case, of course, could have been no real cause) would probably have been equally strong in favor of His laughing, especially since, as we have shown, there is nothing in the latter essentially evil or unbecoming. Against this conclusion only one objection, we think, can be urged which merits serious attention; and this, it must be confessed, is by no means devoid of plausibility. We have said above that it was at least doubtful whether an angel could really laugh, even though he were to inhabit a material body; and this inability we ascribed to the vast range and intuitive character of his knowledge. *A fortiori*, then, our Saviour, who as God knew and had actually present before His mind at all times everything knowable, not only actual, but also possible, could never have experienced the sensation of novelty which, in some degree at least, necessarily accompanies the ludicrous. The difficulty, we have said, is not without weight, but it may, we think, be satisfactorily solved by the method which St. Thomas applies to one precisely similar. He considers (*Sum. The.*, P. 3, quest. 15, art. 8) whether the feeling of wonder was in our Lord, and deciding from the words of the Evangelist, "*Jesus miratus est*," "Jesus wondered," that it was, he puts to himself this objection: Wonder comes from this, that we see an effect, the cause of which is unknown to us; so that wonder implies ignorance. Now Christ was ignorant of nothing, and therefore could not wonder at anything.

It will be observed that the case is a perfectly parallel one to our own. Nothing could be novel or strange to Him who knew all things, actual and possible; therefore He could not be provoked either to laughter or to wonder.

The Angelic Doctor answers his own objection by noting that although nothing could be novel to our Lord, so far as concerns the knowledge which he had as God, nor even if we speak of that science which, though human, was infused, yet if we consider His *experimental* knowledge, He could come upon novelties every day, and this knowledge, gained naturally by Him as man, could have its natural effect in producing genuine wonder in His human mind. Father Faber expresses this distinction between infused and experimental science very well: "He gains no new knowledge. He does not grow in science; he only becomes master by acquisition of the same science of which he was master before in higher ways. He knows certain things, such things as life's experience can teach, in two ways, instead of knowing them in one way. He has now a

double knowledge of them, an acquired knowledge in addition to the infused knowledge He had before." (Bethlehem, *Soul and Body*, p. 267.)

Now just as the *experimental* novelty of acquired knowledge could, and according to the testimony of St. Matthew, really did produce genuine wonder in our Lord, so could it produce genuine laughter. There is still another argument in our favor which we have reserved for the last, because, to our mind at least, it is a very powerful one. What brings a deeper thrill of happiness to a mother's heart than the joyous laugh of her child? Now can we suppose for a moment that our dear Lady, for whom so many sorrows were in store, was denied this poor consolation, which all other mothers enjoy? For our part we love to believe that the silver laugh of the Divine Child, ringing in sudden music through the quiet home at Nazareth, more than once brought sunshine to His mother's human heart. Even Virgil's poetic instinct would not suffer him to think otherwise; for in that almost inspired eclogue, where, by some mysterious dispensation of Providence, he rises from the level of a Pagan poet to the sublime elevation of the Christian seer, in the last most exquisite lines, he calls upon the infant Messias to greet his mother with a laugh:

"Incipe, parve puer, *risu* cognoscere matrem."

THE LATE ENCYCLICAL ON CHRISTIAN MARRIAGE.

ON the following pages of the REVIEW will be found, in its Latin original, and in a translation somewhat more correct than the one generally current amongst our newspapers, the late Encyclical Letter of our Holy Father on Christian Marriage; for this should be its proper heading, not on Divorce, as it has been generally entitled by the press. The mistake would appear to have originated with the cable telegraph and its agents, who seem either unable or unwilling to transmit correctly any important item of Catholic, and especially of Roman, news. Their constant blundering would be simply ludicrous were it not that the malice by which it is too clearly and too often seasoned is very apt to provoke other feelings than mere laughter. And what is strangest of all, their palpable mistake, though involving little harm, has been repeated, and is yet kept up by those from whom more accuracy might have been expected.

In his Encyclical the Holy Father treats of marriage as it was originally established by the Lord and Creator of all, and as it was

re-established, so to speak, by the Divine Lawgiver in person when He walked on earth for our redemption. In other words, he treats of marriage as it is in itself, and as it should be regarded by all who aspire to the Christian name. He pointedly asserts its essential attributes of unity, holiness, and indissolubility. Going back to its first institution in the Garden of Eden, he shows that, as then designed and framed, such must it endure down to the end of time. It was the bond of one man with one woman, and in this consisted its unity. It was to be as lasting as the existence of the contracting parties; and as it is not bodies or souls merely that are given and taken in marriage, but persons, hence arises its essential character of perpetuity, inasmuch as nothing but the extinction of personality can extinguish the marriage bond. And further, how great was the holiness imparted to matrimony from the beginning by its Divine Founder is evident from this, that even then in the foresight of eternal wisdom it prefigured that most intimate union which would one day exist between redeemed humanity and its Redeemer, the bridal of the earthly Church and her heavenly Spouse. Yet even this was, in the divine counsels, nothing more than a faint shadow of another union, not only closer, but far higher and holier, the blending of the weakest with the strongest, of the finite with the Infinite, which it pleased the Deity to accomplish when He assumed our poor, fallen nature through the mystery of the Incarnation.

The Church of the New Testament received this divine institution of marriage from the Old Church, but in a more perfect form, like everything else that had come down to her from the former dispensation. The relation between those two peoples of God, as He himself deigned to call them, was the same that the bud bears to the flower in full bloom, or childhood to the ripeness of age. Their respective treasures of revealed truth stood to each other as types and shadows to reality, as dim twilight to the brightness of noonday. And this enables us better to understand the vicissitudes which this portion of divine revelation had to encounter in early times. This sacrament, for such is the name *latiori sensu* given it by many Fathers even in the Old Law, had been intrusted to the keeping of frail vessels; and in the lapse of ages its sacredness had been somewhat impaired. The Jews, though bearing about with them the mark of the covenant in their flesh, were but too often "uncircumcised in heart," as the Prophet bitterly complains (Jer. ix: 26). For which reason Moses, not of his own accord, but driven to it by "the hardness of their hearts," as Christ Our Lord testifies in the Gospel, had experienced the necessity of tolerating some deviations from the holy rigor which characterized the primeval institution. But the Divine Founder of the New

Law abolished those irregularities, and recalled marriage to its original type of unity and indissolubility. He enriched and ennobled it with the grace and dignity of a sacrament, and willed further that it should become thenceforth a token to mankind of the mysterious blending of the two elements, divine and human, in His new covenant with the children of men. And it was thus exalted and sanctified that Christian marriage came to the Church from the hands of Christ and of His Apostles. It would have been well for the world and for human society at this day had they adhered steadfastly to her authorized teaching of this and of other divine truths.

When Christianity, by a miracle which the most elaborate efforts of human philosophy have so far failed to explain, overran and brought into subjection the Roman world, she rooted out with unsparing hand all its falsities and abominations, that she might renew the face of the earth. At that day men had been taught from the cradle, and confirmed by their schools of learning so called, in false principles and corrupt practices. In these they prided themselves, and they dignified them with the name of civilization, as does this boastful nineteenth century of ours, which has become so blinded by pride and unbelief that it can find no better ideal of perfection than the rotten Paganism of eighteen centuries ago. But the march of the Church was irresistible, for behind her was One stronger than herself; and at His bidding and by His power she overcame the world, not after the fashion of earthly conquerors, by the sharpness and terror of the sword, but, as St. Augustine says, by the healing Wood of the Cross. *Domuit orbem non ferro sed ligno.* To temporal authority she gave a new sanction, mitigating its iron rigor with the law of clemency that sat upon her lips. From subjection she took away the sting of shame by abolishing the element of servile fear; she chastened it with the spirit and enriched it with the merit of Christian obedience. For the hateful motives of self-love and self-interest, that had been hitherto the mainsprings that governed the relations between man and his fellows, she substituted, what was before unknown, the golden bond of Christian charity, grounded on the brotherhood derived from a common Father in Heaven, and consolidated by the additional sacred tie of a common redemption.

Nor was her beneficent work visible only in the political or social order. She well knew that her labor in either sphere would be fruitless, unless the domestic circle were first purified. For the family is not only the origin and primal type of society and of the state, but exercises over both an unceasing and unbounded influence. The Church, therefore, began with domestic life, and sanctified it in its very origin and foundation by recalling the true

meaning and nature of marriage, as instituted by God in the case of our first parents, and holding it up to veneration, invested as it now was, not only with the grace and beauty of a religious rite, but with the dignity and holiness of a sacrament. The change that she wrought was marvellous. Through her teachings the purity of conjugal, as well as of single, life was brought back into a world that had forgotten or remembered only, as if in a dream, this relic of primitive tradition. And this in its turn, like other Christian virtues, was a potent means of subduing the heart of Paganism, and winning it over to that Gospel doctrine which alone could meet all its necessities, and satisfy all its yearnings; for the human soul is by natural instinct thoroughly, or in great part, Christian, as Tertullian, the great Doctor of the African Church, well expresses it.¹ They then learned for the first time, what is after all most conformable to natural reason, that in marriage both parties are alike bound to conjugal chastity, and that, though woman be the weaker vessel, her faithlessness to duty is not more inexcusable than that of him, whom the Apostle styles her "head!" They learned, too, that the prevarication of the husband, who violates his plighted faith by sinful indulgence, is not to be measured by the higher or lower condition of those who subserve his passions, as the Pagan world of old and of our own day imagines,² but solely by the wickedness of his guilty will. The heinousness of adultery was to be estimated in future by the laws of Christ, and not of Cæsar; and all moral cases relative to the marriage state were to be decided by a reference to Paul and not to Papinian, to the inspired and divinely commissioned teacher of the converted

¹ "O testimonium animæ naturaliter Christianæ!" as he exclaims in his rough African idiom. He had, perhaps, these very words of his Apology in his mind years after when, to give them a more correct philosophical or theological sense, he wrote those other words in his treatise *De Testimonio Animæ*, "Fieri enim (O anima), non nasci soles Christiana." The date of the latter work is not known with chronological exactness; but there is no doubt that it was written after the Apology. See amongst others Dom Remy Ceillier in his *Histoire des Auteurs Eccles.* under Tertullien, Prestre et Docteur de l'Eglise, ch. xxviii., art. 9.

² *Quasi culpam dignitas faciat non voluntas*, indignantly exclaims St. Jerome. These words, quoted by the Encyclical, simple as they are, seem to have puzzled unaccountably more than one translator. They are from St. Jerome's Epistle to Oceanus, numbered as Ep. xxx. in the old editions, lxxiv. in the Benedictine edition of Martianay, but Ep. lxxvii. in Vallarsi's edition, which is the best of all. It is not the dignity of the offender, but the grade or condition of his victim, that the Saint alludes to, as is clear enough from the context, which will allow of no other meaning. So, too, with the words quoted further on in the text, "*eadem servitus pari conditione censetur*," which have bothered the translators who examined them apart from their context. The Saint's meaning is evidently: husband and wife are alike servants and bondsmen of Christ, though bearing to each other a special relation as yoke-fellows (implied in their name *conjuges*); hence, they are bound alike by their quality of servants, and the one has no more right to burst his bonds and rebel than the other.

Gentile world instead of the renowned Pagan interpreters of Roman jurisprudence. The language of the great Doctor of the Church, St. Jerome, on this point is so eloquent and beautiful that we cannot withhold it from our readers, especially as some portions of it have been quoted in the Encyclical of our Holy Father.

"*Aliæ sunt leges Cæsarum, aliæ Christi: aliud Papinianus, aliud Paulus noster præcipit. Apud illos viris impudicitia fræna laxantur; et solo stupro atque adulterio condemnato passim per lupanaria et ancillulas libido permittitur, quasi culpam faciat dignitas non voluntas. Apud nos, quod non licet fœminis æque non licet viris, et eadem servitus pari conditione censetur.*"¹

So thoroughly did the converted world acquiesce in the new teaching and legislation of the Church on matrimony, that during the early centuries, and indeed during the greater part of what is known as the Christian era, very few dared to oppose their private judgment on this point to her authority. Not a few from the very earliest days of Christianity "thought and spoke wickedness, and set their mouth against Heaven," as the Psalmist forcibly expresses it.² There was no truth revealed in Scripture or handed down by tradition bearing upon the august mysteries of the Trinity or Incarnation of which their private opinion, or, as they perhaps called it, their rational philosophy, did not make a sport and plaything. But with the sacredness of the marriage contract, as re-established on earth by Our Lord, they did not presume to meddle. The whims and crazy notions of a few Gnostics and Manichees, the latter reappearing at intervals as Paulicians or Albigenses, are the solitary exception that confirms the general rule.

The Christian theory of marriage was not formally called in question, nor any well-organized attempt made to set it aside until those unhappy days when Europe, after having been convulsed for some time by the throes of the new Paganism that was struggling into existence, saw it emerge into light under more than one disguise, but notably that of Reformed Religion. Its sponsors, and those who assisted at its birth, little understood the nature of the young monster whom they had helped to usher into the world. When in after years they looked round them and saw the wickedness, corruption, bloodshed, and manifold woe that had come of their toil and trouble, they sought every pretext to elude the bitter confession of the truth. They pleaded amongst other falsities their youth, their inexperience, lack of sufficient knowledge and

¹ Ep. ad Ocean. Inter Opera Hieronymi. Venetiis, 1766, tom. i., p. 459.

² "Cogitaverunt et locuti sunt nequitiam, iniquitatem in excelso locuti sunt: posuerunt in cœlum os suum."—*Psalm lxxii.*, 8, 9.

of becoming diligence at the outset of their reforming career.' But the fact is that they were the tools, many of them unwillingly or unconsciously, of a stronger power, the spirit of the age in which they lived. They had fostered its growth; and in its turn it overmastered them and forced them to do its will and bidding. The Pagan element that was asserting itself in society clamored for liberty, or license rather, and those obsequious ministers of its caprice granted freely whatever was asked, gilding it beforehand with the specious name of Gospel liberty, and pure religion. The world was growing tired of Christ's yoke and of the restraints of His Revelation. It demanded the right to think for itself independently of God's authority, and to act as it pleased independently of His law. The intellect was to be freed from the shackles imposed by divine teaching, and the flesh was to be emancipated from that bondage in which it was kept by God and His Church. And this emancipation of the flesh Heyne, without the faintest intention of irony, but with the genuine glow of enthusiasm, entitles the crowning glory of the Reformation.

The Reformers, it would almost seem, considered it their mission to degrade matrimony, and thus pave the way for its elimination from the number of Christian ordinances, and for the reintroduction of the natural, or rather purely Pagan, character of marriage. In pursuance of this unhallowed task they began by stripping it of those glorious prerogatives with which it had been invested by the Creator in the Garden of Eden and by Christ Our Lord in the Church of the New Law. They robbed it first of its holiness by casting it down from its high place of honor as a Christian sacrament and relegating it to the civil sphere. Thus in the first official statement of the doctrines of the new religion set

¹ See for example the Confessions of Bucer, of which the following is a specimen: "Haud mirum si ille (Lutherus) alicubi, nos in multis lapsi sumus. Juvenēs enim imperitque prope omnes ad hanc tantam causam pertracti sumus." (It is no wonder that he (Luther) went astray in some points and we in many. For we were, nearly all of us, drawn into this great cause while young and inexperienced.)

And again: "Ego ingenue coram Christo et ecclesia ejus fateor me, cum ad hoc ministerium pertraherer, communiois sanctorum et disciplinæ Christi nec justam scientiam nec dignam curam habuisse. . . . Jam, ubi ego impegi, ibi et complures mystas meos impегisse non nego." (I freely avow before Christ and His church that when I was dragged into this ministry I was wanting in adequate knowledge and efficient care of the communion of Saints and Christian discipline. . . . And where myself stumbled I do not deny that very many of my fellow-ministers have likewise stumbled.)—Ap. DOLLINGER, *Die Reformation*; Regensburg, 1848, vol. ii., p. 33.

This is the Bucer whom Milton, for reasons of his own, extols as a man "of gravity and worth," "a faithful evangelist," "the pastor of nations," "who, if any since the days of Luther, merits to be counted as the Apostle of our Church."—*Milton's Works* (Pickering), vol. iv., p. 302, 303. Besides being an outspoken advocate of divorce and of polygamy, Bucer was notorious for his trickery, habitual falsehood, and double dealing. Luther, who knew him well, denounced him as "a lying varlet."

before the world by its princes and theologians for their own justification, as they alleged, in the articles that treat of "The Sacraments and their Use," there is no mention of Matrimony, not even a word of warning against the doctrine of the Church which attributes to it a sacramental character. It occurs for the first time in the article which is headed "Of Civil Matters" (*De rebus civilibus*), and there it is thrown in promiscuously with the making of bargains, fighting in just wars, holding of property, taking of oaths by order of the magistrate, etc.¹ Calvin, in his *Institutes*, sneeringly adds that if marriage is to be counted a sacrament because it came from the hands of God to mankind, the same claim may be advanced in favor of agriculture, architecture, and the like! Scores of honest Pagan writers have come down to us whose ideas of marriage were more noble and more rational, and loudly cry shame on this pretended Christian reformer.

The next step was to break down its perpetuity by granting to the state, to theologians, and even to individuals (for Luther passed through all these varied phases of opinion), the privilege of annulling any marriage, however valid in the original contract. Not only desertion, but even conjugal disobedience, was to be held as excuse sufficient for this high-handed outrage against the divine commandment. Nothing now remained but to do away with the unity of marriage, though virtually this had been done already by maintaining its dissolubility in so many cases. But even this venerable characteristic of marriage, which constitutes one of the leading features that distinguish civilized nations from utter barbarians and savages, was openly attacked and deliberately set aside by Luther, Bucer, Ochinus, and many others. They preached it in the pulpit and defended it in set works of controversy. When occasion called for it they reduced their theory to practice, as they did in the case of their patron, the Landgrave of Hesse, to whom they gave under their hand and seal a written license or dispensation, as they called it, to have two wives at the same time! Amongst our English-speaking admirers of the great revolt of the sixteenth century and its heroes special pains are taken to palliate and cover up this infamous transaction. It has been adroitly represented as nothing more than a case of divorce, a substitution of Catharine Von Sala for the repudiated Landgravine. No one in Germany would attempt to explain the matter in this way, and it is not creditable to English or American scholarship that such a ridiculous line of defence can find writers to urge and readers to acquiesce in it. Nothing could be more false and unfounded. To

¹ See the Confession of Augsburg, art. xvi., in the 26th volume of the works of Melancthon, better known as *Corpus Reformatorum*, edited by Bretschneider & Bindsell, Halle, 1858.

understand this readily nothing more would be necessary than to read the Lutheran Von Rommel's *Life of Philip of Hesse*, and, above all, the original documents collected in its third volume. This "dispensation" has covered the heads of the Reformation with everlasting disgrace, from which no explanation or excuse can ever rescue them. And it is somewhat to the credit of poor Melanchthon, who was dragged into this wretched affair against his will, that grief and shame on account of this hideous prevarication overpowered him to such an extent as to throw him into a mortal illness, in which he remained hanging for weeks between life and death. After this the very name of the Landgrave became hateful to him, and the least mention of this scandalous business awakened in him an agony of remorse, which lasted for years, until the whole matter seemed to have passed into oblivion. Then he dismissed it from his memory. It is to be hoped that his paroxysms of grief sprang from some higher motive than the dread of seeing his share in the sin and scandal dragged into the light of day.

All these novelties had to be justified by Scripture, for the fashion of the day made it an imperative necessity. Hence this sacred arsenal was ransacked for weapons and texts, and, as might be expected, human ingenuity or sophistry found there an abundance of them to use in the combat against divine truth. It was the old story, what has often happened before and since then, and what was prefigured in the Gospel¹ for our warning,—the Evil One, or those whom he had inspired, making bold to turn God's Word against its Divine Author. But this presumptuous practice has produced its legitimate fruit at last, and the children of those who anxiously searched the Bible for arguments on behalf of divorce and polygamy have come to discover by study of the same source that Christianity is either a myth and fable, or at best an imperfect evolution of progressive mundane truth, and its prophets and apostles amiable dupes, to take the most favorable view of them, or benevolent impostors, who tried to deceive the human race for its good. It is not our purpose here, nor is it necessary, to go over the tortuous ways through which those interpreters wilfully strayed in the wicked attempt to delude themselves and their hearers or readers. Enough that they deliberately set aside the clear teaching of Our Saviour in His Gospel: "What God hath joined together let no man put asunder;" and coolly proposed, if not as a virtue to be admired, at least as a privilege to be enjoyed by all followers of the new Gospel, that very hard-heartedness of the Jews which the Son of Man by explicit declaration had rebuked and condemned as subversive of the original divinely ordained

¹ Matt. iv. 6.

type of matrimony. *Ab initio non fuit sic* is the gloss with which the Divine legislator cancelled the deviations that had crept into His original code. "From the very beginning," He says, "there was no such thing as divorce, for God made marriage one and enduring until death; and though Moses had to tolerate such practices because of the hardness of your hearts, I who have come to restore all things will give back to marriage, too, its pristine form of unity and perpetuity. What, therefore, God originally joined together let no man presume to put asunder."

This is most distinctly and unquestionably the teaching of Our Lord, as may be seen by reading the Evangelists and His inspired Apostle, St. Paul (Cf. Matthew xix. 3-6; Mark x. 5-12; Luke xvi. 18; Romans vii. 2, 3; 1 Cor. vii. 10, 11). And this should suffice for all who aspire to be in name and deed Christians, or "taught of God," as they alone deserve to be styled who receive with implicit faith everything uttered by God's Incarnate Wisdom, when it pleased Him to be seen on earth and converse with the children of men (John vi. 45; Baruch iii. 38). But how are these words of Our Lord received by the proud men who presumed to correct the teaching of His Church, and to alter the belief of all Christendom through all ages? Do they not say as plainly as if they spoke the words: "As long as the New Testament recommends and urges that saving faith by which the sinner is made whole and justified without works of the law (Luke vii. 50; Romans iii. 28), we will listen to its preaching. But when it comes to Gospel precepts that are hard to flesh and blood, we will give up the Lawgiver of the New for him of the Old Testament. Here we prefer Moses to Christ as a teacher. And for our models of perfection in the marriage state we will look henceforth, not to the disciples and friends of the Redeemer, but to His revilers and enemies, to the stiff-necked, hard-hearted race that persecuted the prophets, resisted the Holy Ghost, denied the Holy and Just One, and put the Author of Life, the Son of God, to a cruel and ignominious death."

We will pass over as unworthy of consideration the parenthetic clause of Matthew (v. 32, xix. 9) on which some inside and outside of the Church seem to lay too much stress and exaggerate its difficulty. It refers evidently only to a temporary separation for just cause. Nor could a few doubtful words by any possibility make void the absolute declaration and command of Christ, given in the same breath and repeated by St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. Paul, without any limitation. Besides, it is a dictate of common-sense that all laws are to be interpreted, not by individual caprice of the subjects of the law, but by a legitimate tribunal. And the Church, the tribunal which He established on earth and which He com-

manded us all to "hear," that is to abide by, under penalty of everlasting damnation, has always understood and explained these words as allowing a partial temporary separation, but not the liberty of divorce, properly so called. Besides, it is not so much on this clause as on the law of Moses that heresy has built up its theory of divorce. The clause admits of only one ground of separation or dissolution of the bond, supposing it for a moment to be such. They extend the number indefinitely. Had the advocates of divorce, who bear the Christian name, sought honestly in Holy Writ for a confirmation of their opinion, they would have found it. But where? In the querulous words of those carnal-minded men who were dissatisfied with the rigor of Christ's teaching, and came out boldly to His very face with their *Si ita est, non expedit nubere*. "If the case of the man be so (as Thou sayest) with his wife, it is not good to marry." In other words: "If marriage be robbed of the prospect of divorce when needed, men had better avoid it as a galling yoke and unbearable bondage." Indeed, to generalize somewhat this reflection, it is to be feared that very few professed Bible-readers ever consult the sacred volume with the serious aim of seeking from it what they should believe. They are intent rather on finding in it confirmation of what they have already made up their mind to believe. Hence their perusal of it is necessarily not only one-sided, but superficial. If they would but study or even read it with a little more of attention and of impartiality, they would be astonished, and it is to be hoped disedified to their great advantage, by discovering how much of the new religion that was obtruded on Europe in the sixteenth century to supersede the teaching of the Church, is to be clearly found in Scripture, not, however, proceeding from Christ or His Apostles, but recorded by the inspired penman as coming from the mouths of Scribes, Pharisees, Capharnaïtes, cavilling inquirers, etc.; in a word open enemies or vacillating disciples of Our Lord and His Gospel. And their anti-Catholic argument is for the most part put in the shape of a question, a form of objecting that seems congenital with heresy from its first birth in the Garden of Eden. Thus we hear it asked: "Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition? Who can forgive sins but God alone? How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" with other interrogatories of a like kind. Whence it becomes plainly manifest what and whose spirit it is that accuses the Church (in the person of her Divine Spouse) of Sabbath-breaking, or habitually taunts her with the absurdity of her belief in the Real Presence, Confession, Absolution, etc. But we have no time to go any further in this ample field of investigation.

It was the misfortune of the early Reformers that they were

fighting the battles of Heathenism and were nevertheless compelled by public opinion to argue their case with weapons borrowed in appearance from Scripture. It is no wonder that so many of them, as their private correspondence testifies, became at last tired of life and looked forward to death and the grave as a welcome relief from this painful warfare. Meanwhile the new doctrines, especially those that defined the relation of man and woman, were everywhere producing the results that might have been expected, and that had been confidently foretold by those who remained true to the traditional teachings of the Catholic Church. The paradoxes of Luther, as wild and atrocious as they were shameful and indecent, touching the physical impossibility of continence, re-echoed by every pulpit and diffused broadcast through the land in pamphlets, tracts, manuals of controversy, and even books of devotion, the facilities opened to divorce by theologians, consistories, secular courts, and in too many cases even the tribunal of individual private judgment, all contributed to bring in a deluge of crime and moral devastation upon Germany, which struck the divines and God-fearing laity with horror and dismay, and filled statesmen with alarm for the future of their country.

The wisdom of Christ Our Lord in recalling marriage to its pristine purity and perfection was vindicated by the very men who presumed to undo or improve upon His divine legislation. The reiterated warnings, too, of Catholic theologians and moralists were fully verified. Divorce proved neither a remedy for human weakness nor a check to licentiousness, as its advocates had boastfully promised. All manner of unchastity, and above all adultery, began to abound everywhere. It soon ceased to create horror or even surprise. It was no longer a sin and a shame. It had become the daily bread of the people. It was no longer anything serious, but a matter of jest and laughter. These are literally the complaints, a thousand times repeated, of Luther, Melanchthon, Brentz, Mathesius, Bucer, Sarcerius, of all the leading Reformers. The evil was not here nor there, but everywhere. Nuremberg, Ulm, Strasburg, Wurtemberg, Leipsic, Marburg, Bremen, Brunswick, the proud imperial cities, the market towns, the humblest country villages, were all groaning alike under this plague of uncleanness. Wittenberg, the home of Luther and the Rome of the new religion, asserted its shameful pre-eminence, not only by the orthodoxy of its creed, but perhaps even more by the dissoluteness of its men and women, and above all of its students, till it became the byword of all Germany. Luther, more than once, towards the end of his life, thought of quitting it in horror and disgust. All acknowledged with sighs and lamentations the prevailing moral rotteness; but few, if any, were able or honest enough to trace it to

its true source. Some cast the blame on the Devil; others regarded it, some with fear and trembling, some with joy and hope, as a token of the approaching end of a wicked world. But what is stranger still, is the unaccountable folly of men who kept on from day to day longing for death to come and deliver them from the fierce storm of iniquity they themselves had raised. The pathetic outbursts of Melanchthon alone on this score would fill a good-sized volume. Surely these men must have never read or forgotten the terrible intimation of St. Paul (Heb. ix. 27), that as surely as man must die, so surely shall his death be followed by judgment.

In England an attempted divorce was the first step towards that complex of tyranny, rapine, spoliation, murder, and manifold crime, which has passed into history under the name of "The English Reformation under Henry VIII." The wicked lusts of a blood-thirsty tyrant compelled him to break with the Holy See, in order that he might be free from all hindrance in putting away her who before God and the world was his lawful wife. He found in the Cromwells, Cranmers, and other unprincipled prelates of his court willing tools to consummate an iniquity in which the Pope was restrained by conscience and by the laws of the Church from having any part. To bolster up the nefarious scheme in its successive stages and after completion, they found it necessary to make first a few, and then gradually more innovations in religion. Hence they altered whatever suited their purpose or their inclinations, both in doctrine and in discipline, with no other limits to their attempts than the iron will of the imperious tyrant to whom they had sold themselves as willing slaves, no less in soul than body. And thus it was to a licentious king and a few renegades, the shame and dishonor of the sanctuary, that England was indebted for that insular system of religion which very properly proclaims its utter absence of connection with the true Church of Christendom by assuming the name of Anglicanism. It is a new religion fastened on the people of the country by the high-handed tyranny of its rulers, but which has never yet commanded the homage or respect of one-half of its inhabitants. And the withdrawal of the strong hand of government protection, in other words its disestablishment, which is daily approaching, will inevitably soon number it amongst those human institutions that have had their day, and when factitious support is taken away must forthwith wither and die.

But to the credit of England it must be said that divorce never flourished there, never became popular, nor even gained a partial hold upon the people, though it had been introduced into the country by a popular monarch and taught in its chief school of theology by a reformer of such note as Martin Bucer. Even

Henry VIII. did not venture to shock the Catholic sentiment by proposing openly such a divorce as the sectarian gloss of Scripture, in spite of Christ's express words, has declared lawful and Christian. He disguised his contemplated crime under another name; and, to give it a specious coloring of legality he pretended that his marriage with Catharine had been by canon law null and void from the beginning, and that all he desired was to have its nullity judicially declared. Could he but establish this fiction legally he would have gained possession of Anne Boleyn, the end for which Catharine's repudiation was only a means, without horrifying his Christian subjects. It seems to admit of no doubt that some hereditary feeling of reverence for most of what is holy and true in Christian and Catholic tradition appears to have lingered longer in England than in other countries that threw off the yoke of Catholic obedience in the sixteenth century. Englishmen are often loud, extravagant, almost frantic, in their outcries against Popery and its "superstitions," but for all that Catholic sentiment yet tinges the national mind. The Anglican Church, while recognizing, as Catholics do, the lawfulness of partial divorce (as it is improperly called), that is, a separation *a mensa et thoro*, has never yet, in spite of her erring theologians, officially allowed that parties thus divorced or separated have a right to marry another. And when John Milton for interested motives of his own, no less trifling than unworthy, appealed to the Puritan Parliament to give back to England the freedom of divorce, or, as he calls it, "the most important freedom that God and nature hath given us in the family," his words were received with cold surprise in most quarters, and in some with jeering and derision, of which he bitterly complained. Soon after he was reconciled to his wife, upon which all his theories vanished into thin air. And this notwithstanding the fact that only a little before in the exuberance of his fanaticism—not to call it by a meaner, more odious name—he had pretended almost in express words to have received a call from Heaven to complete the work of England's Reformation, to do away with "unfit marriage, the Protestants' idol," as they had done away with "the Papists' sacrament," by introducing freedom of divorce. And such freedom! Not only large, but limitless. For, in Milton's theory, divorce was to be as thoroughly Protestant as any other article of his creed, or even more so. There was to be no intermeddling on the part of Church or state. Private judgment was to be the only tribunal, the repudiating husband the only judge! This was evidently the cunning device of one whose own case would bear no sifting. In the example of this great poet, but little man, we have another sad commentary on the sincerity of those who set up for reformers of society, play the pompous rôle of benefactors to mankind, boast of their lofty mis-

sion, fortify it by arguments from Scripture and reason, labor to overthrow established order, and set the whole world in a blaze;—and all this merely, if the truth were but known, to gratify some passing whim of their own, some petty ignoble passion! The reforming Puritan had forgotten, it is clear, what in his younger days he had written or sung about one “who steals the souls of men away, under false semblance of religion.”

“Prædatorque hominum falsa sub imagine tectus.”

But, though the spirit of innovation had established itself in Europe, it was only within the last hundred years that the monstrous doctrine and practice of divorce have crept into Catholic countries. For this they have to thank the infamous philosophy of the last century, which assumed the task of rooting out Christianity from Europe and the civilized world. Heathen in its origin, it had been nurtured and strengthened in its growth by the Protestant development in Germany and England. It was from the last country that it made its way into France. Its votaries knew full well that the same attempt had been made by Nero, Decius, Diocletian, Galerius, and Julian, and made in vain, but they were undeterred by the failure of their Pagan predecessors. Many of them from their unhappy training, or from having voluntarily shut their eyes to the evidence that surrounded them on every side, did not believe that the Church was the work of God's hands, and consequently knew not that it was a house or fortress which no human effort could overturn against the will of its Heavenly Builder. But this was not true of all of them. Not a few, led on by the prevailing influence or fashion of the hour, or yet meaner motives, wrote and spoke against their deepest convictions, trusting to the wretched hope—common to all bad Christians, who have retained their faith—that they would some day, at their last hour at the farthest, utter a cry of repentance, and thus obtain mercy and forgiveness. But there were yet others, and who can tell how many, who with open eyes and willing hearts deliberately chose impiety as their portion, spurning all hope and desire of repentance or pardon. Most Christians, who are upright and simple of heart, measuring others by themselves, cannot conceive such a frame of mind to exist in any one, above all in a Christian, who, as the Apostle says, has “once tasted the Heavenly gift” of faith, and would fain hold it for impossible. They are right to some extent, for such a state of the soul is not natural, not human, but purely devilish. And this very word solves the difficulty.

Christ, it is true, by His coming, destroyed the empire of the devil over mankind, but the fulness of this blessing belongs only to those to whom the angel's message announced peace on the

night of His birth, *hominibus bonæ voluntatis*, that is, "to men of good-will." But to those of stubborn and perverse will, who not only refuse obedience to His Law but scout His authority and fling away with contempt His yoke as Teacher of Truth, in a word reject all faith as well as good works, He allows the baneful privilege of going their own way and choosing their own Master. And this explains why it is that the empire of the devil seems growing once more in a world whence Christ Our Lord had done what in Him lay to expel it. For which reason St. Paul exultingly speaks of the Evil One's sway as a thing of the past: "*Diabolum . . . qui habebat imperium.*" Since the decay of faith, for which Neo-Paganism and its offshoot, Protestantism, are both responsible, the devil seems to have returned to busy himself in human affairs with more energy and more success. He of all others it appears evidently is the prime mover and inspirer of the great work of secret societies directed against the work of the Son of God, His revelation, and His Church. And without the aid of these societies irreligion would have made little progress, instead of subjugating Europe as it has nearly succeeded in doing. It is in the awful gloom of these nightly assemblies that man is drawn near to the devil; there that with unthinking rashness he swears homage to his worst enemy and binds himself by oath to do his bidding. And sad experience has shown in too many cases that by this frequent holding of communion with Satan man begins at length to imbibe his spirit and comes at last to be like him in hating God and all His work. He is then ready to stand up deliberately against the Eternal and confront His invincible omnipotence, content if he but succeed in marring, however slightly, His fair work of Redemption, or detracting in the least degree from His glory. His highest pride, and the only miserable satisfaction left him, is that of the foul fiend to whom he has become a willing slave. Since he cannot hope to conquer or overthrow the Divine Ruler, he will be content like his new master,

"To disturb His heaven,
And with perpetual inroads to alarm,
Though inaccessible, His fatal throne."

The "philosophers"—such was the insolent name they gave themselves, just as in our own time they call it "science" to decry Moses and his cosmogony, the Apostles and the Gospel they preached—did not look forward to the possession in their day of political power to be used against Christianity. They longed for the armed hand of a Nero and a Julian, but they did not dream of its speedy coming. Meanwhile, until the hour of coercion by the sword should arrive, they made what use they could of the pen in addition to their other means of seduction. Taking example, if

not actual counsel, from Satan, they concluded to flatter those whom they could not terrify. It was thus their prince and leader had succeeded with our first parents. The same pride which cast Lucifer out of Heaven and Adam out of Eden is the true weak point of human nature; and here they began the assault. They took up the Protestant principle of private judgment, and brought it to such philosophical perfection as even error may be made to reach. To their credit it must be said they for the first time explained the true and full meaning of that principle, and flung away the illogical fetters with which it had been clogged by the arbitrary caprice or caution of the Reformers. Man's private judgment, they correctly said, is as free to reject ten, twenty, or all mysteries as to reject two or three. Creation from nothing, a soul that no sense can reach, the resurrection of a body that our eyes have seen die and perish, are just as irrational and absurd as the Eucharist or the Trinity. The Scripture that teaches such things can only be a mass of falsehood, and to pin one's faith to such authority is to degrade or renounce the dignity of human reason. Thus they not only rightly explained this great principle of Protestantism, but they carried it to the full extent of its logical development. With impious parody of St. Paul (Rom. ii. 29) they said: "Man is a law unto himself. He is sole lord of his whole being, not only of his intellect but also of his will. If he is to own no master of his thoughts, why should he be called on to recognize any power that claims to control his actions?" From this came as a necessary conclusion that individual reason was to be the measure not only of intellectual speculation but also of sensual indulgence. This was, with changed phraseology, the very same liberty or emancipation of the flesh that Luther had introduced with his new Gospel, though tenderness for Christian ears had compelled him to disguise his tenets under the garb of religious language and call the indulgence of brutish passion by the lofty names of "*Opus divinum, opus necessarium, Dei mandatum, etc.*"¹

¹ This he has repeated so often in Latin and German that it is unnecessary to give any reference. Here is a specimen of his detestable principles uttered in the vernacular, some of it from the pulpit, for the benefit of women and children: "Also wenig als in meiner Macht steht dass ich kein Mannsbild sey, also wenig steht es auch bei mir dass ich ohne Weib sei. Wiederum auch also wenig in deiner Macht steht dass du kein Weibsbild seiest, also wenig steht es auch bei dir, dass du ohne Mann seiest. Denn es ist nicht ein freie Willkuhr oder Rath, sondern ein nöthig natürlich Ding, dass Alles was ein Mann ist muss ein Weib haben, und was ein Weib ist muss einen Mann haben." And further: "Wachset und mehret euch, ist nicht ein Gebot, sondern mehr denn ein Gebot, nämlich ein göttlich Werk, das nicht bei uns steht zu verhindern oder nachzulassen, sondern ist eben also Noth, als dass ich ein Mannsbild sei, und nöthiger denn essen und trinken, fegen und auswerfen, schlafen und wachen." Again, read this shameful utterance: "Die brünstige natürliche Neigung zum Weibe

That such men should angrily and contemptuously spurn the laws of the Church and state in Europe regarding divorce was quite natural. But they were after all nothing more than writers, statesmen on paper or in the closet, with no material backing, no way of enforcing their ideas. They had found allies in other men, misguided enthusiasts, more innocent of purpose, but led away by the specious name of liberty, who lost themselves in admiration of the rights of man, utterly unconscious, or criminally forgetful, that God and civilized society may have rights as well as the individual, and that the latter may have, besides his rights, duties also to his Maker and his fellow-man. But, for a long time, these disturbers of society, whether evil-minded revolutionists or idle dreamers, could do nothing more than complain, theorize, and keep on agitating the public mind, and spreading their poison through every available channel, from learned tomes of philosophy and jurisprudence down to tales and romances for youth and the uneducated classes. A day came at last when unexpected circumstances, not suddenly, but gradually, placed in their hands the power of the state. The philosophers reigned, but only to falsify Plato's saying; and France was the unhappy country that the justice of an angry God handed over to their rule. They proceeded by stealthy steps; and it is worthy of notice that, in their new-fangled legislation of 1789, the only *cahier* recommending divorce was the one presented by the wretched coward, Egalité (the father of Louis Philippe), who perished soon after, a victim of the anarchy he had done so much to bring about. Nor is it to be forgotten that in his last hour this idol and slave of the infidel revolutionists had no friend on earth but a priest of the Church that he had so grievously sinned against by his irreligion and other crimes. When these wicked men had succeeded in binding France hand and foot in their chains, they accomplished their purpose; and in 1792 divorce was solemnly legalized in a Christian country, where since the first introduction of the Gospel it had never been known nor tolerated, not even among the Jewish or Protestant subjects of the monarchy. Divorce was subsequently enlarged and its facilities increased, until at last, somewhat modified, it found a permanent place in the Code Napoleon. After the restoration of the old Bourbon dynasty, notwithstanding the worthless character of the king and his infidel counsellors, an organized movement, springing from the Christian sentiment of the country, was set on foot for the abolition of this new and iniquitous law of divorce. The

kann weder mit Gelübden noch mit Gesetzen verhindert werden, denn es ist Gottes Wort und Werk." Cf. Luther's Werke (Walch's ed.), iii. 64, 412; v. 2011; vi. 2750, viii. 1099; xviii. 2148; xix. 904; xxii. 1470, 1695, 1700, 1713, 1726, 1763, 1806, 2070.

movement was successful, and in 1816 this foul blot was erased from the pages of French legislation. After the Revolution of 1831, in the reign of Louis Philippe, fresh attempts were made to re-enact this anti-Christian law. But, though they found favor in the Chamber of Deputies, they were always rejected by the Upper House or Chamber of Peers, which represented the Catholic conservative element of the nation.

Since then more than one storm of revolution has burst upon the head of that unhappy country. The events of February, 1848, made her a republic. Then came the now-forgotten Louis Napoleon, first as Prince President, and afterwards as Emperor. "My uncle's nephew" could not fail to introduce the Code Napoleon, and with it divorce, into his new empire. He had even the sacrilegious temerity to insist in his infamous letter to Colonel Ney (written, it has been said by way of excuse, amid the fumes and excitement of one of his orgies), that the Vicar of Christ should adopt this irreligious code for the government of his states; or, failing to do this, he must expect no longer the support of France against his enemies. Never yet, since the days of St. Peter, had the Head of the Christian Church been thus insulted. Never had he heard such outrageous language from Protestant Prince or Russian Czar, not even from a Mohammedan ruler. What wonder is it that God has launched against himself and his house such signal retribution for this and other crimes against the majesty of His Vicar on earth! His empire was overthrown in the field by the iron host of Prussia, that he had affected to despise; in the streets of his capital by a handful of puny miscreants. He died alone, unpitied, and, it is to be feared, unrepentant, in a strange land; and divine vengeance, that visits the sins of fathers on their children, has not spared even his unoffending son. One might well repeat *Et nunc Reges intelligite!* but in vain. The warning will ever remain unheeded, as it has been since first uttered by King David (Ps. ii. 10).

The revolution that overthrew the dynasty of Louis Napoleon, it may be justly supposed did not do away with the unchristian liberty of divorce. Even had the new government repealed all the laws of the banished emperor, their character is such as to warrant the belief that they would cheerfully grant any and every right, such as human law can make it, to trample on the Law of God and His Gospel.

From France this impious legislation, by the arts of infidel statesmen and the secret societies, has passed into other Catholic countries. Italy, which is governed not by its people, as some innocent newspaper-readers imagine, but by a handful of Free Masons and unbelievers, is, or is soon to be, in the same condition.

It is true that the first article of their Constitution declares that the Catholic religion is, and shall be inviolably, the religion of the country. But this is only a sham and dead letter, and placed there, at the beginning of their legislative career, merely as a blind to delude the simple. Their whole course shows, even had we not known their intentions beforehand, that their aim is to abolish Catholicity in Italy as a preliminary step to abolish Christianity throughout the civilized world. And one of their favorite ideas is to elevate the sensual man, to encourage in every way and promote his growth and full development, knowing well that this is the surest way to annihilate in him all that is spiritual and Christian. Hence their freedom of divorce and other legalized abominations, with the details of which we shall not offend the reader.

In the Protestant portions of Europe divorce is alarmingly on the increase. In the Prussian Empire it is bad enough; but in Switzerland it is still worse, the rate per cent. of divorce there exceeding that of any other region of Europe. And the enormity of the evil appears more fully when we reflect that in Switzerland two-fifths and in Germany three-eighths of the population must be deducted before taking into account the number of those among whom divorce exists. These are Catholics, and therefore to be excluded when it is a question of divorce statistics. *Kultur*, as they call it, is loud in boasting that it has taken in hand the subjugation of the world and is gradually completing its task. The old Roman civilization made the same boast, perhaps with more truth. However, in both cases a conquered world has been avenged by the scourge of sensuality that has come in the conqueror's train.

"Sævior armis
Luxuria incubuit victumque ulciscitur orbem."

Even in England the wicked spirit of the age has begun to triumph over the stubborn conservatism for which that country was distinguished, and by the law of 1857 (Act of 20 and 21 Vict. c. 85) divorce has been cheapened for the masses, instead of being, what it was heretofore, a luxury for the noble and wealthy. What shall we say of our own country? Its divorce record has become of late years absolutely disgraceful, especially in some of the Western and in the New England States. In some of them the number of marriages remain stationary, while the number of divorces goes on increasing from year to year at a frightful rate. In little Rhode Island, it is said, there is one divorce to every ten marriages! The secular press throws out fitfully, now and then, an indignant protest against this disordered legislation. The so-called religious (non-Catholic) papers are dumb. They see nothing to alarm them

in this growing corruption of morals. They are too intent on watching, and warning their readers against, imaginary dangers from the Pope and the Jesuits. And yet, by the side of this increasing deluge of legalized immorality, of what account is growing material prosperity, the expansion of commerce, the reclaiming and building up of the Western wilderness? "Shall the shield of the law continue to protect and foster the growth of moral and social corruption?" is a question of far more importance to the welfare of the country than "What party is to triumph at the next election?" or, "Who shall be our next President?" Yet those who have undertaken, or at least profess to be the teachers of the people, instead of seriously devoting themselves to this vital question, will not give it a moment's attention.

Was it not full time for our Holy Father to issue his voice of warning to the world, and thus rouse, if possible, the well-intentioned from their lethargy? He is the common Father of all, and though all do not recognize his authority, none are shut out from his paternal solicitude. Oh! that they would give ear to his words, so full of Christian truth and gentle persuasion. They would be almost exclusively the gainers by it. For, as a rule, Catholic peoples and communities have nothing to amend, nothing to reproach themselves with in this matter of divorce, since they have never abandoned the Gospel rule. He appeals to them, if they will not hear the Church in everything, to hear her at least in this, and to heal their wounds, confessed by themselves, by restoring Christian marriage to that high dignity with which it was invested by him whom they acknowledge for a Divine Legislator.

EPISTOLA ENCYCLICA LEONIS PAPÆ XIII.

SANCTISSIMI DOMINI NOSTRI

LEONIS

DIVINA PROVIDENTIA

PAPÆ XIII.

EPISTOLA ENCYCLICA.

*Ad Patriarchas, Primates, Archiepiscopos et Episcopos Universos Catholici Orbis
Gratiam et Communionem cum Apostolica Sede habentes.*

*Venerabilibus Fratribus Patriarchis, Primatibus, Archiepiscopis et Episcopis Universis
Catholici Orbis Gratiam et Communionem cum Apostolica Sede habentibus,*

LEO PP. XIII.

Venerabiles Fratres, Salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem.

ARCANUM divinae sapientiae consilium, quod Salvator, hominum Iesus Christus in terris erat perfecturus, eo spectavit, ut mundum, quasi vetustate senescentem, Ipse per se et in se divinitus instauraret. Quod splendida et grandi sententia complexus est Paullus Apostolus, cum ad Ephesios ita scriberet: *Sacramentum voluntatis suae . . . instaurare omnia in Christo quae in caelis et quae in terra sunt.*¹ Revera cum Christus Dominus mandatum facere instituit quod dederat illi Pater, continuo novam quamdam formam ac speciem rebus omnibus impertiit, vetustate depulsa. Quae enim vulnera piaculum primi parentis humanae naturae imposuerat, Ipse sanavit: homines universos, natura filios irae, in gratiam cum Deo restituit; diuturnis fatigatos erroribus ad veritatis lumen traduxit; omni impuritate confectos ad omnem virtutem innovavit; redonatisque hereditati beatitudinis sempiternae spem certam fecit, ipsum eorum corpus, mortale et caducum, immortalitatis et gloriae caelestis particeps aliquando futurum. Quo vero tam singularia beneficia, quamdiu essent homines, tandiu in terris permanerent, Ecclesiam constituit vicariam muneris sui, eamque iussit, in futurum prospiciens, si quid esset in hominum societate perturbatum, ordinare; si quid collapsum, restituere.

Quamquam vero divina haec instauratio, quam diximus, praecipue et directo homines attigit in ordine gratiae supernaturali constitutos, tamen pretiosi ac salutes eiusdem fructus in ordinem quoque naturalem largiter permanarunt; quomobrem non mediocrem perfectionem in omnes partes acceperunt cum singuli homines, tum humani generis societas universa. Etenim, Christiano rerum ordine semel condito, hominibus singulis feliciter contigit, ut edicerent atque adsuescerent in paterna Dei providentia conquiescere, et spem alere, quae non confundit, caelestium auxiliorum; quibus ex rebus fortitudo, moderatio, constantia, aequabil-

¹ Ad Eph. i., 9, 10.

itas pacati animi, plures denique praeclaræ virtutes et egregia facta consequuntur. Societati vero domesticæ et civili mirum est quantum dignitatis, quantum firmitudinis et honestatis accesserit. Aequior et sanctior effecta principum auctoritas; propensior et faciliior populorum obtemperatio; arctior civium coniunctio; tutiora iura domini. Omnino rebus omnibus, quæ in civitate habentur utiles, religio christiana consuluit et providit; ita quidem, ut, auctore S. Augustino, plus ipsa afferre momenti ad bene beateque vivendum non potuisse videatur, si esset parandis vel augendis mortalis vitæ commodis et utilitatibus unice nata.

Verum de hoc genere toto non est Nobis propositum modo singula enumerare; volumus autem de convictu domestico eloqui, cuius est in *matrimonio* principium et fundamentum.

Constat inter omnes, Venerabiles Fratres, quæ vera sit matrimonii origo. Quamvis enim fidei christianæ vituperatores perpetuam hac de re doctrinam Ecclesiæ fugiant agnoscere, et memoriam omnium gentium, omnium saeculorum delere iamdiu contendant, vim tamen lucemque veritatis nec extinguere nec debilitare potuerunt. Nota omnibus et nemini dubia commemoramus: posteaquam sexto creationis die formavit Deus hominem de limo terræ, et inspiravit in faciem eius spiraculum vitæ, sociam illi voluit adiungere, quam de latere viri ipsius dormientis mirabiliter eduxit. Qua in re hoc voluit providentissimus Deus, ut illud par coniugum esset cunctorum hominum naturale principium, ex quo scilicet propagari humanum genus, et, numquam intermissis procreationibus, conservari in omne tempus oporteret. Atque illa viri et mulieris coniunctio, quo sapientissimis Dei consiliis responderet aptius, vel ex eo tempore duas potissimum, easque in primis nobiles, quasi alte impressas et insculptas prae se tulit proprietates, nimirum unitatem et perpetuitatem. Idque declaratum aperteque confirmatum ex Evangelio perspicimus divina Iesu Christi auctoritate; qui Iudæis et Apostolis testatus est, matrimonium, ex ipsa institutione sui dumtaxat inter duos esse debere, scilicet virum inter et mulierem; ex duobus unam veluti carnem fieri; et nuptiale vinculum sic esse Dei voluntate intime vehementerque nexum, ut a quopiam inter homines dissolvi, aut distrahi nequeat. *Adhaerebit (homo) uxori suæ et erunt duo in carne una. Itaque iam non sunt duo, sed una caro. Quod ergo Deus coniunxit, homo non separet.*¹

Verum hæc coniugii forma, tam excellens atque præstans, sensim corrumpi et interire apud ethnicos populos coepit; et penes ipsum Hebraeorum genus quasi obnubilari atque obscurari visa. Nam apud hos de uxoribus susceperat consuetudo communis, ut singulis viris habere plus una liceret; post autem, cum *ad duritiam cordis*² eorum indulgenter permisisset Moyses repudiorum potestatem, ad divortium factus est aditus. In societate vero ethnicorum vix credibile videatur, quantam corruptelam et demutationem nuptiæ contraxerint, quippe quæ obiectæ fluctibus essent errorum uniuscuiusque populi et cupiditatum turpissimarum. Cunctæ plus minus gentes dediscere notionem germanamque originem matrimonii visæ sunt; eamque ob causam de coniugiis passim fere-

¹ Matt. xix. 5, 6.² Matt. xix. 8.

bantur leges, quae esse e republica viderentur, non quas natura postuleret. Sollemnes ritus, arbitrio legumlatorum inventi, efficiebant ut honestum uxoris, aut turpe concubinae nomen mulieres nanciscerentur; quin eo ventum erat, ut auctoritate principum reipublicae caveretur, quibus esset permissum inire nuptias, et quibus non esset, multum legibus contra aequitatem contendentibus, multum pro iniuria. Praeterea polygamia, polyandria, divortium causae fuerunt, quamobrem nuptiale vinculum magnopere relaxaretur. Summa quoque in mutuis coniugum iuribus et officiis perturbatio extitit, cum vir dominium uxoris acquireret, eamque suas sibi res habere, nulla saepe justa causa, iuberet; sibi vero ad effrenatam et indomitam libidinem praecipiti impune liceret *excurrere per lupanaria et ancillas, quasi culpam dignitas faciat, non voluntas*.¹ Exsuperante viri licentia, nihil erat uxore miserius, in tantam humilitatem deiecta, ut instrumentum pene haberetur ad explendam libidinem, vel gignendam sobolem comparatum. Nec pudor fuit, collocandas in matrimonium emi, vendi, in rerum corporearum similitudinem,² data interdum parenti maritoque facultate extremum supplicium de uxore sumendi. Talibus familiam ortam connubiis necesse erat aut in bonis reipublicae esse, aut in mancipio patrifamilias,³ cui leges hoc quoque posse dederant, non modo liberorum conficere et dirimere arbitrato suo nuptias, verum etiam in eosdem exercere vitae necisque immanem potestatem.

Sed tot vitiis, tantisque ignominiis, quibus erant inquinata coniugia, sublevatio tandem et medicina divinitus quaesita est; quandoquidem restitutor dignitatis humanae legumque mosaicarum perfectior Iesus Christus non exigua, neque postremam de matrimonio curam adhibuit. Etenim nuptias in cœna in Cana Galilaeae Ipse praesentia sua nobilitavit, primoque ex prodigiis a se editis fecit memorabiles;⁴ quibus causis vel ex eo die in hominum coniugia novae cuiusdam sanctitudinis initia videntur esse profecta. Deinde matrimonium revocavit ad primaevae originis nobilitatem, cum Hebraeorum mores improbando, quod et multitudine uxorum et repudii facultate abuterentur; tum maxime praeicipiendo, ne quis dissolvere auderet quod perpetuo coniunctionis vinculo Deus ipse constrinxisset. Quapropter cum difficultates diluisset ab institutis mosaicis in medium allatas, supremi legislatoris suscepta persona, haec de coniugibus sanxit: *Dico autem vobis, quia quicumque dimiserit uxorem suam, nisi ob fornicationem et aliam duxerit, moechatur; et qui dimissam duxerit, moechatur*.⁵

Verum quae auctoritate Dei de coniugiis decreta et constituta sunt, ea nuncii divinarum legum Apostoli plenius et enucleatius memoriae literisque prodiderunt. Iamvero Apostolis magistris accepta referenda sunt, quae *sancti Patres nostri, Concilia et universalis Ecclesiae traditio semper docuerunt*,⁶ nimirum Christum Dominum ad Sacramenti dignitatem evexisse matrimonium; simulque effecisse ut coniuges, caelesti gratia quam merita eius pepererunt septi ac muniti, sanctitatem in ipso coniugio adipiscerentur; atque in eo ad exemplar mystici connubii sui cum

¹ Hieronym. Oper., tom. i., col. 455.

² Dionys. Halicar., lib. ii., c. 26, 27.

³ Matt. xix. 9.

⁴ Arnob. *adv. Gent.* 4.

⁵ Ioan. ii.

⁶ Trid. sess. xxiv. in pr.

Ecclesia mire conformato, et amorem, qui est naturae consentaneus perfecisse,¹ et viri ac mulieris individuam suapte natura societatem divinae caritatis vinculo validius coninunxisse. *Viri*, Paullus inquit ad Ephesios, *diligite uxores vestras, sicut et Christus dilexit Ecclesiam et seipsum tradidit pro ea, ut illam sanctificaret. . . . Viri debent diligere uxores suas ut corpora sua nemo enim unquam carnem suam odio habuit; sed nutrit et fovet eam, sicut et Christus Ecclesiam; quia membra sumus corporis eius, de carne eius et de ossibus eius. Propter hoc relinquet homo patrem et matrem suam et adhaerebit uxori suae et erunt duo in carne una. Sacramentum hoc magnum est: ego autem dico in Christo et in Ecclesia.*² Similiter Apostolis auctoribus didicimus unitatem, perpetuamque firmitatem, quae ab ipsa requirebatur nuptiarum origine, sanctam esse et nullo tempore violabilem Christum iussisse. *Iis qui matrimonio iuncti sunt, idem Paullus ait, praecipio non ego, sed Dominus, uxorem a viro non discedere; quod si discesserit, manere innuptam, aut viro suo reconciliari.*³ Et rursus: *Mulier allegata est legi, quanto tempore vir eius vivit: quod si dormierit vir eius, liberata est.*⁴ Hisce igitur causis matrimonium extitit sacramentum magnum,⁵ honorabile in omnibus,⁶ pium castum, rerum altissimarum imagine et significatione verendum.

Neque iis dumtaxat quae commemorata sunt, christiana eius perfectio absolutioque continetur. Nam primo quidem nuptiali societati excelsius quiddam et nobilius propositum est, quam antea fuisset; ea enim spectare iussa est non modo ad propagandum genus humanum, sed ad ingenerandam Ecclesiae sobolem, *cives Sanctorum et domesticos Dei;*⁷ *ut nimirum populus ad veri Dei et Salvatoris nostri Christi cultum et religionem procrearetur atque educaretur.*⁸ Secundo loco sua utrique coniugum sunt officia definita, sua iura integre descripta. Eos scilicet ipsos necesse est sic esse animo semper affectos, ut amorem maximum, constantem fidem, sollers assiduumque praesidium alteri alterum debere intelligant. Vir est familiae princeps, et caput mulieris; quae tamen, quia caro est de carne ilius et os de ossibus eius, subiiciatur pareatque viro, in morem non ancillae, sed sociae; ut scilicet obedientiae praestitae nec honestas, nec dignitas absit.

In eo autem qui praeest, et in hac quae paret, cum imaginem uterque referant alter Christi, altera Ecclesiae, divina caritas esto perpetua moderatrix officii. Nam *vir caput est mulieris, sicut Christus caput est Ecclesiae. . . . Sed sicut Ecclesia subjecta est Christo, ita et mulieres viris suis in omnibus.*⁹ Ad liberos quod pertinet, subesse et obtemperare parentibus, hisque honorem adhibere propter conscientiam debent; et vicissim in liberis tuendis atque ad virtutem potissimum informandis omnes parentum curas cogitationesque evigilare necesse est: *Patres, . . . educate illos (filios) in disciplina et correptione Domini.*¹⁰ Ex quo intelligitur, nec pauca esse coniugum officia, neque levia; ea tamen coniugi-

¹ Trid., sess. xxiv., cap. i., de reform. matr.

³ I Cor. vii. 10, 11.

⁵ Ad Eph. v. 32.

⁷ Ad Eph. iii. 19.

⁹ Ad Eph. v. 23, 24.

² Ad Ephes. v. 25 et seq.

⁴ I Cor. vii. 39.

⁶ Ad Hebr. xii. 4.

⁸ Catech. Rom., cap. viii.

¹⁰ Ad Eph. vi. 4.

bus bonis, ob virtutem quae Sacramento percipitur, non modo tolerabilia fiunt, verum etiam iucunda.

Christus igitur, cum ad talem ac tantam excellentiam matrimonia renovavisset, totam ipsorum disciplinam Ecclesiae credidit et commendavit. Quae potestatem in coniugia christianorum omni cum tempore, tum loco exercuit, atque ita exercuit, ut illam propriam eius esse appareret, nec hominum concessu quaesitam, sed auctoris sui voluntate divinitus adeptam. Quot vero et quam vigiles curas in retinenda sanctitate nuptiarum collocavit, ut sua his incolumitas maneret, plus est cognitum quam ut demonstrari debeat. Et sane improbatos novimus Concilii Hierosolymitani sententia amores solutos et liberos;¹ civem Corinthium incesti damnatum beati Pauli auctoritate;² propulsatos ac reiectos eodem semper tenore fortitudinis conatus plurimorum matrimonium christianum hostiliter petentium, videlicet Gnosticorum, Manichaeorum, Montanistarum sub ipsa rei christianae primordia; nostra autem memoria Mormonum, San-Simonianorum, Phalansterianorum, Communistarum. Simili modo ius matrimonii aequabile inter omnes atque unum omnibus est constitutum, vetere inter servos et ingenuos sublato discrimine;³ exaequata viri et uxoris iura; etenim, ut aiebat Hieronymus,⁴ *apud nos quod non licet feminis, aequè non licet viris, et eadem servitus pari conditione censetur*: atque illa eadem iura ob remunerationem benevolentiae et vicissitudinem officiorum stabiliter firmata; adserta et vindicata mulierum dignitas; vetitum viro poenam capitis de adultera sumere,⁵ iuratamque fidem libidinose atque impudice violare. Atque illud etiam magnum est quod de potestate patrumfamilias Ecclesia, quantum oportuit, limitaverit, ne filiis et filiabus coniugi cupidis quidquam de iusta libertate minueretur;⁶ quod nuptias inter cognatos et affines certis gradibus nullas esse posse decreverit,⁷ ut nimirum supernaturalis coniugum amor latiore se campo diffunderet; quod errorem et vim et fraudem, quantum potuit, a nuptiis prohibenda curaverit;⁸ quod sanctam pudicitiam thalami, quod securitatem personarum,⁹ quod coniugiorum decus,¹⁰ quod religionis incolumitatem¹¹ sarta tecta esse voluerit. Denique tanta vi, tanta providentia legum divinum istud institutum communiit, ut nemo sit rerum aequus existimator, quin intelligat, hoc etiam ex capite quod ad coniugia refertur, optimam esse humani generis custodem ac vindicem Ecclesiam; cuius sapientia et fugam temporum, et iniurias hominum, et rerum publicarum vicissitudines innumerabiles victrix evasit.

Sed, adnitante humani generis hoste, non desunt qui, sicut cetera redemptionis beneficia ingrate repudiant, sic restitutionem perfectionemque

¹ Act. xv. 29.

² 1 Cor. v. 5.

³ Cap. 1, de coniug. serv.

⁴ Oper., tom. i., col. 455.

⁵ Can. *Interfectores* et can. *Admonere*, quaest. 2.

⁶ Cap. 30, quaest. 3, cap. 3, de cognat. spirit.

⁷ Cap. 8, de consang. et affin.; cap. 1, de cognat. legali.

⁸ Cap. 26, de sponsal.; capp. 13, 15, 29, de sponsal. et matrim.; et alibi.

⁹ Cap. 1, de convers. infid.; capp. 5 et 6, de eo qui duxit in matr.

¹⁰ Capp. 3, 5, et 8, de sponsal. et matr.; trid. sess. xxiv., cap. 3, de reform matr.

¹¹ Cap. 7, de divorc.

matrimonii aut spernunt, aut omnino non agnoscunt. Flagitium nonnullorum veterum est, inimicos fuisse nuptiis in aliqua ipsarum parte; sed multo aetate nostra peccant perniciosius qui earum naturam, perfectam expletamque omnibus suis numeris et partibus, malunt funditus pervertere. Atque huius rei caussa in eo praecipue sita est, quod imbuti falsae philosophiae opinionibus corruptaque consuetudine animi plurimorum nihil tam moleste ferunt, quam subesse et parere; acerrimeque laborant, ut non modo singuli homines, sed etiam familiae atque omnis humana societas imperium Dei superbe contemnant. Cum vero et familiae et totius humanae societatis in matrimonio fons et origo consistat, illud ipsum iurisdictioni Ecclesiae subesse nullo modo patiuntur; imo delicere ab omni sanctitate contendunt, et in illarum rerum exiguum sane gyrum compellere, quae auctoribus hominibus institutae sunt, et iure civili populorum reguntur atque administrantur. Unde sequi necesse erat, ut principibus reipublicae ius in connubia omne tribuerent, nullum Ecclesiae esse decernerent; quae si quando potestatem eius generis exercuit, id ipsum esse aut indulgentia principum, aut iniuria factum. Sed iam tempus esse inquit, ut qui rempublicam gerunt, iidem sua iura fortiter vindicent, atque omnem coniugiorum rationem arbitrio suo moderari aggrediantur. Hinc illa nata, quae *matrimonia civilia* vulgo appellantur; hinc scitae leges de caussis, quae coniugiis impedimento sint; hinc iudiciales sententiae de contractibus coniugalibus, iure ne initi fuerint, an vitio. Postremo omnem facultatem in hoc genere iuris constituendi et dicandi videmus Ecclesiae catholicae praereptam tanto studio, ut nulla ratio habeatur nec divinae potestatis eius, nec providarum legum, quibus tamdiu vixere gentes, ad quas urbanitatis lumen cum christiana sapientia pervenisset.

Attamen *Naturalistae* iique omnes, qui reipublicae numen se maxime colere profitentes, malis hisce doctrinis totas civitates miscere nituntur, non possunt reprehensionem falsitatis effugere. Etenim cum matrimonium habeat Deum auctorem, fueritque vel a principio quaedam Incarnationis Verbi Dei abumbratio, ideoque inest in eo sacrum et religiosum quiddam, non adventitium, sed ingenuum, non ab hominibus acceptum, sed natura insitum. Quocirca Innocentius III.¹ et Honorius III.,² decessores Nostri, non iniuria nec temere affirmare potuerunt, *apud fideles et infideles existere Sacramentum coniugii*. Testamur et monumenta antiquitatis, et mores atque instituta populorum, qui ad humanitatem magis accesserant et exquisitiore iuris et aequitatis cognitione praestiterant: quorum omnium mentibus informatum anticipatumque fuisse constat, ut cum de matrimonio cogitarent, forma occurreret rei cum religione et sanctitate coniunctae. Hanc ob caussam nuptiae apud illos non sine caerimoniis religionum, auctoritate pontificum, ministerio sacerdotum fieri saepe consueverunt. Ita magnam in animis caelesti doctrina carentibus vim habuit natura rerum, memoria originum, conscientia generis humani! Igitur cum matrimonium sit sua vi, sua natura, sua sponte sacrum, consentaneum est, ut regatur ac temperetur non principum im-

¹ Cap. 8, de divor.² Cap. II, de transact.

perio, sed divina auctoritate Ecclesiae, quae rerum sacrarum sola habet magisterium. Deinde considerata sacramenti dignitas est, cuius accessione matrimonia christianorum evasere longe nobilissima. De sacramentis autem statuere et praecipere, ita, ex voluntate Christi, sola potest et debet Ecclesia, ut absonum sit plane potestatis eius vel minimam partem ad gubernatores rei civilis velle esse translatam. Postremo magnum pondus est, magna vis historiae, qua luculenter docemur, potestatem legiferam et iudicalem, de qua loquimur, libere constanterque ab Ecclesia usurpari consuevisse iis etiam temporibus, quando principes reipublicae consentientes fuisse aut conniventes in ea re, inepte et stulte fingeretur. Illud enim quam incredibile, quam absurdum, Christum Dominum damnassee polygamiae repudiique inveteratam consuetudinem delegata sibi a procuratore provinciae vel a principe Iudaeorum potestate; similiter Paullum Apostolum divortia incestasque nuptias edixisse non licere, cedentibus aut tacite mandantibus Tiberio, Caligula, Nerone! Neque illud unquam homini sanae mentis potest persuaderi, de sanctitate et firmitudine coniugii,¹ de nuptiis servos inter et ingenuas² tot esse ab Ecclesia conditas leges, impetrata facultate ab Imperatoribus romanis, inimicissimis nomini christiano, quibus nihil tam fuit propositum, quam vi et caede religionem Christi opprimere adolescentem; praesertim cum ius illud ab Ecclesia profectum a civili iure interdum adeo dissideret, ut Ignatius Martyr,³ Iustinus,⁴ Athenagoras,⁵ et Tertullianus,⁶ tamquam iniustas vel adulterinas publice traducerent nonnullorum nuptias, quibus tamen imperatoriae leges favebant. Postea vero quam ad christianos Imperatores potentatus omnis reciderat, Pontifices maximi et Episcopi in Concilia congregati, eadem semper cum libertate conscientiaque iuris sui, de matrimoniis iubere vetare perseverarunt quod utile esse, quod expedire temporibus censuissent, utcumque discrepans ab institutis civilibus videretur. Nemo ignorat quam multa de impedimentis ligaminis, voti, disparitatis cultus, consanguinitatis, criminis, publicae honestatis in Conciliis Illiberitano,⁷ Arelatensi,⁸ Chalcedonensi,⁹ Milevitano II.¹⁰ aliisque, fuerint ab Ecclesiae praesulibus constituta, quae a decretis iure imperatorio sancitis longe saepe distarent. Quin tantum abfuit, ut viri principes sibi adsciscerent in matrimonia christiana potestatem, ut potius eam, quanta est, penes Ecclesiam esse agnoscerent et declararent. Revera Honorius, Theodosius iunior, Iustinianus¹¹ fateri non dubitarunt, in iis rebus quae nuptias attingant, non amplius quam custodibus et defensoribus sacrorum canonum sibi esse licere. Et de connubiorum impedimentis si quid per edicta sanxerunt, causam docuerunt non inviti, nimirum id sibi sumpsisse ex Ecclesiae permissu atque auctoritate;¹² cuius ipsius iudicium exquirere et reverenter accipere consueverunt in

¹ Can. Apost., 16, 17, 18.

² Epist. ad Polycarp, cap. 5.

³ Legat. pro Christian., nn. 32, 33.

⁴ De Aguirre Conc. Hispan., tom. i., can. 13, 15, 16, 17.

⁵ Harduin., Act. Concil., tom. i., can. 11.

⁶ Ibid. can. 17.

⁷ Fejer *Matrin. ex instit. Christ.*, Pest, 1835.

⁸ Philosophum Oxon., 1851.

⁹ Apolog. mai., n. 15.

¹⁰ De coron. milit., cap. 13.

¹¹ Ibid. can. 16.

¹² Novel., 137.

controversiis de honestate natalium,¹ de divortiis,² denique de rebus omnibus cum coniugali vinculo necessitudinem quoquo modo habentibus.³ Igitur iure optimo in Concilio Tridentino definitum est in Ecclesiae potestate esse *impedimenta matrimonium dirimentia constituere*,⁴ *et causas matrimoniales ad iudices ecclesiasticos spectare*.⁵

Nec quemquam moveat illa tantopere a Regalistis praedicata distinctio, vi cuius contractum nuptialem a sacramento disiungunt, eo sane consilio, ut, Ecclesiae reservatis sacramenti rationibus, contractum tradant in potestatem arbitriumque principum civitatis. Etenim non potest huiusmodi distinctio, seu verius distractio, probari; cum exploratum sit in matrimonio christiano contractum a sacramento non esse dissociabilem; atque ideo non posse contractum verum et legitimum consistere, quin sit eo ipso sacramentum. Nam Christus Dominus dignitate sacramenti auxit matrimonium; matrimonium autem est ipse contractus, si modo sit factus iure. Huc accedit, quod ob hanc causam matrimonium est sacramentum, quia est sacrum signum et efficiens gratiam, et imaginem referens mysticarum nuptiarum Christi cum Ecclesia. Istarum autem forma ac figura illo ipso exprimitur summae coniunctionis vinculo, quo vir et mulier inter se conligantur, quodque aliud nihil est nisi ipsum matrimonium. Itaque apparet, omne inter christianos iustum coniugium in se et per se esse sacramentum: nihilque magis abhorrere a veritate, quam esse sacramentum decus quoddam adjunctum, aut proprietatem allapsam extrinsecus, quae a contractu disiungi ac disparari hominum arbitratu queat.

Quapropter nec ratione efficitur, nec teste temporum historia comprobatur potestatem in matrimonia christianorum ad principes reipublicae esse iure traductam. Quod si hac in re alienum violatum ius est, nemo profecto dixerit esse ab Ecclesia violatum.

Utinam vero Naturalistarum oracula, ut sunt plena falsitatis et iniustitiae, ita non etiam essent fecunda detrimentorum et calamitatum. Sed facile est pervidere quantam profanata coniugia perniciem attulerint; quantam allatura sint universae hominum communitati. Principio quidem lex est provisa divinitus, ut quae Deo et natura auctoribus instituta sunt, ea tanto plus utilia ac salutaria experiamur, quanto magis statu nativo manent integra atque incommutabilia; quandoquidem procreator rerum omnium Deus probe novit quid singularum institutioni et conservationi expediret, cunctasque voluntate et mente sua sic ordinavit, ut suum unaquaeque exitum convenienter habitura sit. At si rerum ordinem providentissime constitutum immutare et perturbare hominum temeritas aut improbitas velit, tum vero etiam sapientissime atque utilissime instituta aut obesse incipiunt, aut prodesse desinunt, vel quod vim iuvandi mutatione amiserint, vel quod tales Deus ipse poenas malit de mortalium superbia atque audacia sumere. Iamvero qui sacrum esse matrimonium negant, atque omni despoliatum sanctitate in rerum profanarum coniiciunt genus, ii pervertunt fundamenta naturae, et divinae

¹ Cap. 3, de ordin. cognit.

³ Cap. 13, qui filii sint legit.

⁵ Ibid. can. 12.

² Cap. 3, de divort.

⁴ Trid. sess. xxiv., can. 4.

providentiae tum consiliis repugnant, tum instituta, quantum potest, demoliuntur. Quapropter mirum esse non debet, ex huiusmodi conatibus insanis atque impiis eam generari malorum segetem, qua nihil est saluti animorum, incolumitatisque reipublicae perniciosius.

Si consideretur quorsum matrimoniorum pertineat divina institutio, id erit evidentissimum, includere in illis voluisse Deum utilitatis et salutis publicae uberrimos fontes. Et sane, praeter quam quod propagationi generis humani prospiciunt, illuc quoque pertinent, ut meliorem vitam coniugum beatioremque efficiant; idque pluribus caussis, nempe mutuo ad necessitates sublevandas adiumento, amore constanti et fideli, communione omnium bonorum, gratia caelesti, quae a sacramento proficiscitur. Eadem vero plurimum possunt ad familiarum salutem; nam matrimonia quamdiu sint congruentia naturae, Deique consiliis apte convenient, firmare profecto valebunt animorum concordiam inter parentes, tueri bonam institutionem liberorum, temperare patriam potestatem proposito divinae potestatis exemplo, filios parentibus, famulos heris facere obedientes. Ab eiusmodi autem coniugiis expectare civitates iure possunt genus et sobolem civium qui probè animati sint, Deique reverentia atque amore assueti, sui officii esse ducant iuste et legitime imperantibus obtemperare, cunctos diligere, laedere neminem.

Hos fructus tantos ac tam praeclaros tamdiu matrimonium revera genuit, quamdiu munera sanctitatis, unitatis, perpetuitatisque retinuit, a quibus vim omnem accipit frugiferam et salutarem; neque est dubitandum similes paresque ingeneraturum fuisse, si semper et ubique in potestatem fidemque fuisset Ecclesiae, quae illorum munerum est fidissima conservatrix et vindex. Sed quia modo passim libuit humanum ius in locum naturalis et divini supponere, deleri non solum coepit matrimonii species ac notio praestantissima, quam in animis hominum impresserat et quasi consignaverat natura; sed in ipsis etiam Christianorum coniugiis, hominum vitio, multum vis illa debilitata est magnorum bonorum procreatrix. Quid est enim boni quod nuptiales afferre possint societates, unde abscedere Christiana religio iubetur, quae parens est omnium bonorum, maximasque alit virtutes, excitans et impellens ad decus omne generosi animi atque excelsi? Illa igitur semōta ac reiecta, redigi nuptias oportet in servitutem vitiosae hominum naturae et pessimarum dominarum cupiditatum, honestatis naturalis parum valido defensas patrociniō. Hoc fonte multiplex derivata perniciēs, non modo in privatas familias, sed etiam in civitates influxit. Etenim salutari depulso Dei metu, sublataque curarum levatione, quae nusquam alibi est quam in religione Christiana maior, persaepe fit, quod est factu proclive, ut vix ferenda matrimonii munera et officia videantur; et liberari nimis multum vinculum velint, quod iure humano et sponte nexum putant, si dissimilitudo ingeniorum, aut discordia, aut fides ab alterutro violata, aut utriusque consensus, aliaeve caussae liberari suadeant oportere. Et si forte satis fieri procacitati voluntatum lege prohibeatur, tum iniquas clamant esse leges, inhumanas, cum iure civium liberorum pugnantes;

quapropter omnino videndum ut, illis antiquatis abrogatisque, licere divortia humaniore lege decernatur.

Nostrorum autem temporum legumlatores, cum eorundem iuris principiorum tenaces se ac studiosos profiteantur, ab illa hominum improbitate, quam diximus, se tueri non possunt, etiamsi maxime velint: quare cedendum temporibus ac divortiorum concedenda facultas. Quod historia idem ipsa declarat. Ut enim alia praetereamus, exeunte saeculo superiore, in illa non tam perturbatione quam deflagratione Galliarum, cum societas omnis, amoto Deo, profanaretur, tum demum placuit ratas legibus esse coniugum discessionem. Easdem autem leges renovari hoc tempore multi cupiunt, propterea quod Deum et Ecclesiam pelli e medio ac submoveri volunt a societate coniunctionis humanae; stulte putantes extremum grassanti morum corruptelae remedium ab eiusmodi legibus esse quaerendum.

At vero quanto materiam mali in se divortia contineant, vix attinet dicere. Eorum enim caussa fiunt maritalia foedera mutabilia; extenuatur mutua benevolentia; infidelitati perniciose incitamenta suppeditantur; tuitioni atque institutioni liberorum nocetur; dissuendis societatibus domesticis praebetur occasio; discordiarum inter familias semina sparguntur; minuitur ac deprimitur dignitas mulierum, quae in periculum veniunt ne, cum libidini virorum inservierint, pro derelictis habeantur. Et quoniam ad perdendas familias, frangendasque regnorum opes nihil tam valet, quam corruptela morum, facile perspicitur, prosperitati familiarum ac civitatum maxime inimica esse divortia, quae a depravatis populorum moribus nascuntur, ac, teste rerum usu, ad vitiosiores vitae privatae et publicae consuetudines aditum ianuamque patefaciunt. Multoque esse graviora haec mala constabit, si consideretur, frenos nullos futuros tantos, qui concessam semel divortiorum facultatem valeant intra certos, aut ante provisos, limites coercere. Magna prorsus est vis exemplorum, maior cupiditatum: hisce incitamentis fieri debet, ut divortiorum libido latius quotidie serpens plurimorum animos invadat, quasi morbus contagione vulgatus, aut agmen aquarum superatis aggeribus exundans.

Haec certe sunt omnia per se clara; sed renovanda rerum gestarum memoria fiunt clariora. Simul ac iter divortiis tutum lege praestari coepit, dissidia, simultates, secessionem plurimum crevere; et tanta est vivendi turpitudine consecuta, ut eos ipsos, qui fuerant talium discessionum defensores, facti poenituerint; qui nisi contraria lege remedium mature quaesissent, timendum erat, ne praeceptum in suam ipsa perniciem respublica dilaberetur. Romani veteres prima divortiorum exempla dicuntur inhorruisse; sed non longa mora sensus honestatis in animis obstupescere, moderator cupiditatis pudor interire, fidesque nuptialis tanta cum licentia violari coepit, ut magnam veri similitudinem habere videatur quod a nonnullis scriptum legimus, mulieres non mutatione consulum, sed maritorum enumerare annos consuevisse. Pari modo apud Protestantes principio quidem leges sanxerant, ut divortia fieri liceret certis de causis, iisque non sane multis; istas tamen propter rerum similitudinem affinitatem, compertum est in tantam multitudinem ex-

crevisse apud Germanos, Americanos, aliosque, ut qui non stulte sapuis-
sent, magnopere defendendam putarint infinitam morum depravationem,
atque intolerandam legum temeritatem. Neque aliter se res habuit in
civitatibus catholici nominis: in quibus si quando datus est coniugio-
rum discidiis locus, incommodorum, quae consecuta sunt, multitudo
opinionem legislatorum longe vicit. Nam scelus plurimorum fuit, ad
omnem malitiam fraudemque versare mentem, ac per saevitiam adhibi-
tam, per iniurias, per adulteria fingere causas ad illud impune dissolv-
endum, cuius pertaesum esset, coniunctionis maritalis vinculum: idque
cum tanto publicae honestatis detrimento, ut operam emendandis legi-
bus quamprimum dari omnes indicaverint oportere.

Et quisquam dubitabit, quin exitus aequae miseros et calamitosos habi-
turae sint leges divortiorum faurices, sicubi forte in usum aetate nostra
revocentur? Non est profecto in hominum commentis vel decretis fac-
ultas tanta, ut immutare rerum naturalem indolem conformationemque
possint: quapropter parum sapienter publicam felicitatem interpretan-
tur, qui germanam matrimonii rationem impune perverti posse putant;
et, qualibet sanctitate cum religionis tum Sacramenti posthabita, diffin-
gere ac deformare coniugia turpius velle videntur, quam ipsa ethnicorum
instituta consuevisent. Ideoque nisi consilia mutantur, perpetuo sibi
metuere familiae et societas humana debebunt, ne miserrime coniiciantur
in illud rerum omnium certamen atque discrimen, quod est Social-
istarum ac Communistarum flagitiosis gregibus iamdiu propositum.
Unde liquet quam absonum et absurdum sit publicam salutem a di-
vortiis expectare, quae potius in certam societatis perniciem sunt evasura.

Igitur confitendum est, de communi omnium populorum bono mer-
uisse optime Ecclesiam Catholicam, sanctitati et perpetuitati coniugio-
rum tuendae semper intentam; nec exiguam ipsi gratiam deberi, quod
legibus civicis centum iam annos in hoc genere multa peccantibus palam
reclamaverit;¹ quod haeresim deterrimam Protestantium de divortiis et
repudiis anathemate perculerit;² quod usitatam graecis diremptionem
matrimoniorum multis modis damnaverit;³ quod irritas esse nuptias
decreverit ea conditione initas, ut aliquando dissolvantur;⁴ quod demum
vel a prima aetate leges imperatorias repudiarit, quae divortiis et repu-
diis perniciose favissent.⁵ Pontifices vero maximi quoties restiterunt
principibus potentissimis, divortia a se facta ut rata Ecclesiae essent
minaciter petentibus, toties existimandi sunt non modo pro incolumitate
religionis, sed etiam pro humanitatis gentium propugnasse. Quam

¹ Pius VI. epist. ad epise. Lucion. 28 Maii 1793. Pius VII. litter. encycl. die 17 Febr. 1809, et const. dat. die 19 Iul. 1817. Pius VIII. litt. encycl. die 29 Maii 1829. Gregorius XVI. Const. dat. die 15 Augusti 1832. Pius IX. alloc. habit. die 22 Sept. 1852.

² Trid. sess. xxiv., can. 5 et 7.

³ Concil. Floren. et Instr. Eug. IV. ad Armenos, Bened. XIV. Const. *Et si pastor-
alis*, 6 Maii 1742.

⁴ Cap. 7, *de condit appos.*

⁵ Hieron. epist. 79 ad Ocean. Ambros. lib. vi. in cap. 16 Lucae, n. 5. August, de nuptiis, cap. 10.

ad rem omnis admirabitur posteritas invicti animi documenta a Nicolao I. edita adversus Lotharium; ab Urbano II. et Paschali II. adversus Philippum I. regem Galliarum; a Caelestino III. et Innocentio III. adversus Alphonsum a Leone et Philippum II. principem Galliarum; a Clemente VII. et Paulo III. adversus Henricum VIII.; denique a Pio VII. sanctissimo fortissimoque Pontifice adversus Napoleonem I., secundis rebus et magnitudine imperii exultantem.

Quae cum ita sint, omnes gubernatores administratoresque rerum publicarum, si rationem sequi, si sapientiam, si ipsam populorum utilitatem voluissent, malle debuerant sacras de matrimonio leges intactas manere, oblatumque Ecclesiae adiumentum in tutelam morum prosperitatemque familiarum adhibere, quam ipsam vocare Ecclesiam in suspicionem inimicitiae, aut in falsam atque iniquam violati iuris civilis insimulationem.

Eoque magis, quod Ecclesia catholica, ut in re nulla potest ab religione officii et defensione iuris sui declinare, ita maxime solet esse ad benignitatem indulgentiamque proclivis in rebus omnibus, quae cum incolumitate iurium et sanctitate officiorum suorum possunt una consistere. Quam ob rem nihil unquam de matrimoniis statuit, quin respectum habuerit ad statum communitatis, ad condiciones populorum; nec semel suarum ipsa legum praescripta, quoad potuit, mitigavit, quando ut mitigaret caussae iustae et graves impulerunt. Item non ipsa ignorat neque diffitetur, sacramentum matrimonii, cum ad conservationem quoque et incrementum societatis humanae dirigatur, cognationem et necessitudinem habere cum rebus ipsis humanis, quae matrimonium quidem consequuntur, sed in genere civili versantur: de quibus rebus iure decernunt et cognoscunt qui rei publicae praesunt.

Nemo autem dubitat, quin Ecclesiae conditor Iesus Christus potestatem sacram voluerit esse a civili distinctam, et ad suas utramque res agendas liberam atque expeditam; hoc tamen adiuncto, quod utrique expedit, et quod interest omnium hominum, ut coniunctio inter eas et concordia intercederet, in iisque rebus quae sint, diversa licet ratione, communis iuris et iudicii, altera, cui sunt humana tradita, opportune et congruenter ab altera penderet, cui sunt caelestia concredita. Huiusmodi autem compositione, ac fere harmonia, non solum utriusque potestatis optima ratio continetur, sed etiam opportunissimus atque efficacissimus modus iuvandi hominum genus in eo quod pertinet ad actionem vitae et ad spem salutis sempiternae. Etenim sicut hominum intelligentia, quemadmodum in superioribus Encyclicis Litteris ostendimus, si cum fide christiana conveniat multum nobilitatur multoque evadit ad vitandos ac repellendos errores munitior, vicissimque fides non parum praesidii ab intelligentia mutuatur; sic pariter, si cum sacra Ecclesiae potestate civilis auctoritas amice congruat, magna utrique necesse est fiat utilitatis accessio. Alterius enim amplificatur dignitas, et, religione praeunte, numquam erit non iustum imperium: alteri vero adiumenta tutelae et defensionis in publicum fidelium bonum suppeditantur.

Nos igitur, hurum rerum consideratione permoti, cum studiose alias, tum vehementer in praesenti viros principes in concordiam atque amicitiam iungendam iterum hortamur; iisdemque paterna cum benevolen-

tia veluti dexteram primi porrigimus, oblato supremæ potestatis Nostræ auxilio, quod tanto magis est hoc tempore necessarium, quanto ius imperandi plus est in opinione hominum, quasi accepto vulnere, debilitatum. Incensis iam procaci libertate animis, et omne imperii, vel maxime legitimi, iugum nefario ausu detrectantibus, salus publica postulat, ut vires utriusque potestatis consocientur ad prohibenda damna, quæ non modo Ecclesiæ, sed ipsi etiam civili societati impendent.

Sed cum amicam voluntatum coniunctionem valde suademus, precamurque Deum, principem pacis, ut amorem concordiæ in animos cunctorum hominum iniiciat, tum temperare Nobis ipsi non possumus, quin Vestram industriam, Venerabiles Fratres, Vestrum studium ac vigilantiam, quæ in Vobis summa esse intelligimus, magis ac magis hortando incitemus. Quantum contentione assequi, quantum auctoritate potestis, date operam, ut apud gentes fidei Vestræ commendatas integra atque incorrupta doctrina retineatur, quam Christus Dominus coelestis et Apostoli tradiderunt, quamque Ecclesia catholica religiose ipsa servavit, et a Chistifidelibus servari per omnes ætates iussit.

Praecipuas curas in id insumite, ut populi abundant præceptis sapientiæ christianæ, semperque memoria teneant matrimonium non voluntate hominum, sed auctoritate nutuque Dei fuisse initio constitutum, et hac lege prorsus ut sit unius ad unam: Christum vero novi Foederis auctorem illud ipsum ex officio naturæ in Sacramenta transtulisse, et quod ad vinculum spectat, legiferam et iudicalem Ecclesiæ suæ adtribuisse potestatem. Quo in genere cavendum magnopere est, ne in errorem mentes inducantur a fallacibus conclusionibus adversariorum, qui eiusmodi potestatem ademptam Ecclesiæ vellent. Similiter omnibus exploratum esse debet, si qua coniunctio viri et mulieris inter Christifideles citra Sacramentum contrahatur, eam vi ac ratione iusti matrimonii carere; et quamvis convenientur legibus civicis facta sit, tamen pluris esse non posse, quam ritum aut morem, iure civili introductum; iure autem civili res tantummodo ordinari atque administrari posse, quas matrimonia efferunt ex sese in genere civili, et quas gigni non posse manifestum est, nisi vera et legitima illarum caussa, scilicet nuptiale vinculum, existat. Haec quidem omnia probe cognita habere maxime sponsorum refert, quibus etiam probata esse debent et notata animis, ut sibi liceat hac in re morem legibus genere; ipsa non abnuente Ecclesia, quæ vult atque optat ut in omnes partes salva sint matrimoniorum effecta, et ne quid liberis detrimenti afferatur. In tanta autem confusione sententiarum, quæ serpunt quotidie longius, id quoque est cognitu necessarium, solvere vinculum coniugii inter christianos rati et consummati nullis in potestate esse; ideoque manifesti criminis reos esse, si qui forte coniuges, quaecumque demum caussa esse dicatur, novo se matrimonii nexu ante implicare velint, quam abrumpi primum morte contigerit. Quod si res eo devenerint, ut convictus ferri diutius non posse videatur, tum vero Ecclesia sinit alteram ab altera seorsum agere, adhibendisque curis ac remediis ad coniugum conditionem accommodatis, lenire studet secessionis incommoda; nec umquam committit, ut de reconcilianda concordia aut non laboret aut desperet. Verum hæc extrema sunt; quo facile esset

non descendere, si sponsi non cupiditate acti, sed praesumptis cogitatione tum officiis coniugum, tum caussis coniugiorum nobilissimis, ea qua aequum est mente ad matrimonium accederent; neque nuptias anteverterent continuatione quadam serieque flagitiorum, irato Deo. Et ut omnia paucis complectamur, tunc matrimonia placidam quietamque constantiam habitura sunt, si coniuges spiritum vitamque hauriant a virtute religionis, quae forti invictoque animo esse tribuit; quae efficit ut vitia, si qua sint in personis, ut distantia morum et ingeniorum, ut curarum maternas pondus, ut educationis liberorum operosa sollicitudo, ut comites vitae labores, ut casus adversi non solum moderate, sed etiam libenter perferrantur.

Illud etiam cavendum est, ne scilicet coniugia facile appetantur cum alienis a catholico nomine: animos enim de disciplina religionis dissidentes vix sperari potest futuros esse cetera concordēs. Quin imo ab eiusmodi coniugiis ex eo maxime perspicitur esse abhorrendum, quod occasionem praebent vetitae societati et communicationi rerum sacrarum, periculum religioni creant coniugis catholici, impedimento sunt bonae institutioni liberorum, et persaepe animos impellunt, ut cunctarum religionum aequam habere rationem assuescant, sublato veri falsique discrimine. Postremo loco, cum probe intelligamus, alienum esse a caritate Nostra neminem oportere, auctoritati fidei et pietati Vestrae, Venerabiles Fratres, illos commendamus, valde quidem miseros, qui aestu cupiditatum abrepti, et salutis suae plane immemores contra fas vivunt, haud legitimi matrimonii vinculo coniuncti. In his ad officium revocandis hominibus Vestra sollers industria versetur; et cum per Vos ipsi, tum interposita virorum bonorum opera, modis omnibus contendite, ut sentiant se flagitiose fecisse, agant nequitiae poenitentiam, et ad iustas nuptias ritu catholico ineundas animum inducant.

Haec de matrimonio christiano documenta ac praecepta, quae per has litteras Nostras Vobiscum, Venerabiles Fratres, communicanda censuimus, facile videtis, non minus ad conservationem civilis communitatis, quam ad salutem hominum sempiternam magnopere pertinere. Faxit igitur Deus ut quanto plus habent illa momenti et ponderis, tanto dociles promptosque magis ad parendum animes ubique nanciscantur. Huius rei gratia, supplice atque humili prece omnes pariter opem imploremus beatae Mariae Virginis Immaculatae, quae, excitatis mentibus ad obediendum fidei, matrem se et adiutricem hominibus impertiat. Neque minore studio Petrum et Paullum obsecremus, Principes Apostolorum, domitores superstitionis, satores veritatis, ut ab eluvione renascentium errorum humanum genus firmissimo patrocinio tueantur.

Interea caelestium munerum auspice et singularis benevolentiae Nostrae testem, Vobis omnibus, Venerabiles Fratres, et populis vigilantiae Vestrae commissis, Apostolicam Benedictionem ex animo impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, die 10 Februarii an. 1880, Pontificatus Nostri Anno Secundo.

LEO PP. XIII.

[TRANSLATION.]

ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF OUR MOST HOLY LORD, LEO XIII., BY DIVINE PROVIDENCE POPE.

*To all the Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops and Bishops of the Catholic World
holding Grace and Communion with the Apostolic See.*

Venerable Brethren : Health and Apostolic Benediction.

THE hidden counsel of divine wisdom, which Jesus Christ, the Saviour of men, was to accomplish on earth, had for its purpose that He, through Himself and in Himself, should divinely restore the world which, so to speak, had grown old with age and decay. This much is expressed in that grand saying of St. Paul to the Ephesians, "The mystery of his will . . . to re-establish all things in Christ that are in heaven and on earth." And truly when Christ Our Lord set about fulfilling the commandment given Him by His Father, He forthwith imparted to all things a new form and beauty, banishing every trace of age and decay. For the wounds which the sin of our first parent had inflicted on human nature He himself healed ; He brought back all men, by nature children of wrath, into favor with God ; He led into the light of truth those who were wearied with long wanderings ; He renewed to every virtue those who were worn out by every kind of impurity ; and, restoring them to the inheritance of everlasting blessedness, he gave them a certain hope that their very body, mortal and frail as it was, should one day be partaker of immortality and heavenly glory. And that such wonderful blessings might endure on earth as long as men existed, He constituted the Church to carry on His work, and, looking forward to the future, commanded it to set in order whatever in human society might have become confused, and to restore whatever might have fallen to ruin.

But although this divine restoration, of which we have spoken, mainly and directly concerns men who are in the supernatural order of grace, nevertheless its precious and saving fruits have largely flowed into the natural order also ; the result of which, not only to individuals, but to human society in general, has been no scanty measure of perfection in all respects. For the Christian order being once established, it became the happy lot of every man to learn and accustom himself to rest in the fatherly providence of God, and to cherish that hope of heavenly help which does not bring to confusion, from which follow fortitude, moderation, constancy, the equability of a mind at peace, and many great virtues and noble deeds. And to domestic and civil society also there has come a wonderful accession of dignity, stability, and honor. The authority of rulers has been made more just and more holy ; the obedience of peoples readier and more easy ; the tie between citizens closer ; the rights of property more secure. The Christian religion has attended to and provided for everything of acknowledged utility in a state, so that,

according to St. Augustine, it could not have contributed more to the welfare and happiness of existence if the good and advantage of our mortal life had been the sole end for which it came into being. We do not intend to enumerate all the instances of this ; but we desire to speak of domestic life, of which the source and the foundation are in *matrimony*.

The origin of marriage, Venerable Brethren, is well known among all. For, although the revilers of the Christian faith are loath to acknowledge the constant teaching of the Church on this subject, and have been long endeavoring to obliterate the record of all nations and all ages, they have been unable to extinguish or weaken the strength and light of truth. We are speaking of what is known to all and doubtful to none. When on the sixth day of creation God formed man out of the slime of the earth, and breathed into his face the breath of life, it was His will to give him a companion, whom He brought forth wonderfully from the side of the man himself as he slept. And in this the design of God's providence was that this married pair should be the natural source of all mankind, and that from them the human race should be propagated, and, by uninterrupted course of procreation, be preserved to all time. And the union of the man and the woman, in order more perfectly to correspond to the wise counsels of God, bore upon its face two especial properties, noble above all, and, as it were, deeply impressed and engraved, namely, unity and perpetuity. And we see this announced and openly confirmed in the Gospel by the divine authority of Jesus Christ, who declared to the Jews and to the Apostles that marriage from its very institution was to be between two only, the husband and the wife, that of two there was to be as it were one flesh ; and that the nuptial bond was by the will of God so closely and strongly woven that it cannot be unloosed or broken by any among men. A man "shall cleave to his wife, and the two shall be in one flesh. Therefore now they are not two, but one flesh. What therefore God has joined together let no one man put asunder." (Matt. xix. 5, 6.)

But this form of marriage, so excellent and admirable, began by degrees to be corrupted and to die out among the heathen nations ; and it seemed to be overclouded and darkened even in the Hebrew race. For among the latter common usage had sanctioned the possession by each man of more than one wife, and afterwards, when the indulgence of Moses had conceded "to the hardness of their hearts" (Matt. xix. 8) the power of repudiation, a door was opened to divorce. As to pagan society it is scarcely credible how marriage became corrupted and disfigured, exposed as it was to the flood of each people's errors and most shameful desires. Every nation, more or less, seems to have lost the idea and forgotten the true origin of marriage, and consequently laws were in many places enacted which seemed useful to the state rather than conformable to the requirements of nature. Solemn ceremonies, invented at the will of legislators, were the cause of the honorable name of wife, or the disgraceful name of concubine, being given to women ; and the authority of the rulers of the state even took upon itself to de-

cide who were and who were not to be allowed to marry, the laws being, to a great extent, contrary to equity, and resulting often in the commission of injustice. Moreover polygamy, polyandry, and divorce were the cause of a great relaxation of the nuptial tie. There was also a great disturbance of the mutual rights and duties of married persons when the husband acquired dominion over the wife, and commanded her, often without just cause, to go her way, while he assumed to himself, in his propensity to unbridled and untamed lust, the license to "roam with impunity amongst women of servile condition or infamous life, as if the guilt of sin depended on rank and not on the will." (Hieronymi Ep. ad Oceanum. Oper., tom. i., col. 459.) With this prevailing licentiousness on the part of husbands, nothing could be more wretched than the wife, who was reduced to such an abject condition that she was considered a mere instrument provided for the purpose of satisfying the passions or producing offspring. Nor was it thought shameful to buy and sell marriageable girls like chattels (Arnob. *adv. gent.* 4); the power of inflicting capital punishment on the wife being sometimes given to the parent and the husband. The families which owed their existence to such marriages as these were necessarily either the property of the state or owned as slaves by the father of the family, to whom the laws gave the right, not only to conclude and dissolve their marriages at his will, but even to exercise over them the monstrous power of life and death.

But at length a relief and remedy were divinely provided for all the ignominious evils with which marriages had been defiled; for Jesus Christ, the restorer of human dignity, and the perfecter of the Mosaic laws, did not make the subject of matrimony His least or last care. He ennobled the nuptials of Cana of Galilee by His presence, and made them memorable by the performance of the first of His miracles; so that from that day dates the beginning of the new holiness which descended upon human marriage. Then He recalled matrimony to the nobility of its primeval origin, both by reproving the abuses introduced by the Jews as to both the plurality of wives and the privilege of repudiation, and by teaching them above all that no one might put asunder that which God had bound together by the chain of perpetual union. Therefore, after solving the difficulties adduced from the Mosaic institutes, assuming the part of a supreme lawgiver, He pronounced this decision in reference to married persons: "And I say to you, that whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery; and he that shall marry her that is put away committeth adultery." (Matt. xix. 9.)

But the Apostles, heralds of God's legislation, have more fully and in greater detail delivered to memory and to writing those things which have been decreed and established by divine authority in regard to marriage. For to no other teaching than of the Apostles must be referred what "our Holy Fathers, the Councils, and the tradition of the Universal Church have always taught" (Trid. sess. xxiv., in pr.), namely, that Christ Our Lord raised matrimony to the dignity of a sacrament; that He at the same time ordained that married people, guarded and

protected by the celestial grace provided by His merits, should derive holiness from marriage itself; and in it, in a manner wonderfully resembling the mystical union between Him and His Church, He perfected the love which accords with nature (Trid. sess. xxiv., cap. 1, *de reform. matr.*) and cemented the natural union of the man and woman more firmly in the bonds of divine charity. "Husbands," Paul says to the Ephesians, "love your wives as Christ also loved the Church, and delivered Himself up for it, that He might sanctify it. . . . So also ought men to love their wives as their own bodies, . . . for no man ever hated his own flesh; but nourisheth and cherisheth it as also Christ does the Church; because we are members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones. For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother; and shall cleave to his wife, and they shall be two in one flesh. This is a great sacrament, but I speak in Christ and in the Church." (Ad Ephes. v. 25 *et seq.*) And in the same manner we learn from the teaching of the Apostles that Christ commanded that the union and perpetual constancy which was required from the first commencement of marriages should be held sacred and should not at any time be violated. The same Paul says: "But to them that are married, not I, but the Lord commandeth that the wife depart not from her husband. And if she depart, that she remain unmarried or be reconciled to her husband." (1 Cor. vii. 10, 11.) And again: "A woman is bound by the law as long as her husband liveth, but if her husband die she is at liberty." (Ibid. v. 39.) For these causes, therefore, matrimony has been made "a great sacrament" (Ad Eph. v. 32), "honorable in all" (Ad Hebr. xiii. 4), pious, chaste, and venerable as representing and signifying the most exalted mysteries. Nor is its Christian perfection and completeness confined to those things which have been mentioned. For in the first place something more exalted and noble has been given to the conjugal union than it had before, inasmuch as it was bid to look not merely to the propagation of the human race but to the procreation of offspring to the Church, "fellow-citizens with the saints and the domestics of God" (Ad Eph. ii. 19), "that a people may be begotten and trained to religion and to the worship of the true God and of Our Saviour Jesus Christ" (Catech. Rom. cap. viii.). In the second place the duties of both parties in marriage are defined and their rights fully laid down. It is incumbent upon them to bear in mind and understand that each owes to the other the greatest love, a constant fidelity, and careful and assiduous support. The man is the chief of the family, and the head of the woman, who nevertheless, inasmuch as she is flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bone, should be subject to and obey the man, not as a servant, but as a companion; and so neither honor nor dignity is lost by the rendering of obedience. But let divine charity ever regulate duty both in him who commands and in her who obeys, since both are images, the one of Christ, the other of His Church. For "the husband is the head of the wife, as Christ is the head of the Church. . . . But as the Church is subject to Christ so also let wives be to their husbands in all things." (Ad Eph. v. 23, 24). As regards

children, they are bound to obey and be subject to their parents, and to do them honor for conscience sake ; and, on the other hand, every care and forethought should be vigilantly exercised by parents to protect their children and above all to train them to virtue : “ Fathers, bring them ” (your children) “ up in the discipline and the correction of the Lord.” (Ad Eph. vi. 4). Whence it may be understood that the duties of married people are neither few nor light ; yet to those who are virtuous they become, by the grace imparted through the Sacrament, not only easy to bear, but even a source of happiness.

Therefore Christ, having renewed matrimony to such and so great an excellence, intrusted and commended its entire discipline to the Church. And she has exercised authority over the marriages of Christians at every time and in every place, and has so exercised it as to show that it was her own inherent right, not obtained by the concession of men, but divinely bestowed by the will of her Author. How many and how vigilant were the pains which she took to retain the sanctity of marriages, in order that their inviolability might be preserved to them, is so well known that it need not be pointed out. And we know that loose and free love was forbidden by the sentence of the Council of Jerusalem (Act xv. 29), that the Corinthian citizen was condemned for incest by the authority of St. Paul (1 Cor. v. 5), and that the attempts of very many persons who attacked Christian marriage, to wit, Gnostics, Manichæans, Montanists, in the very beginning of Christianity, and within our memory Mormons, St. Simonians, Phalansterians, and Communists, have been opposed and rejected with the same vigor. In like manner the rights of marriage have been made equal among all persons and the same for all, the ancient distinction between slaves and the freeborn being put an end to (cap. *de conjug. serv.*), the rights of husband and wife have been equalized ; for, as Jerome said (Oper., tom. i., col. 455), “ among us what is not lawful for women is equally unlawful for men, and the same obligation results from equal servitude,” and those same rights, tending to promote mutual good-will and reciprocal kindness, have been firmly established ; the dignity of woman has been asserted and vindicated ; it has been forbidden to a husband to inflict capital punishment on an adulteress (Can. *Interfectores*, et Can. *Admonere*, quæst. 2), or with a wanton unchastity to violate his own plighted faith. And it is also very important that the Church, as far as is right, has limited the power of fathers of families, so that their sons and daughters when desirous of marriage should not have their just liberty diminished (cap. 30, quæst. 3 ; cap. 3, *de cognat spirit.*) ; that she has decreed that there could be no marriages between relations and kindred within certain degrees (cap. 8, *de consang. et affîn.* ; cap. 1, *de cognat legati.*), so that the supernatural love of married persons might diffuse itself over a wider field ; that she has taken care that marriages should, as far as possible, be guarded against error, force and fraud (cap. 26, *de sponsal.* ; capp. 13, 15, 29, *de sponsal. et matrim.* ; et alibi). That she has willed the holiness of the marriage-bed, the security of persons (cap. 1. *de convers. infid.* ; capp. 5, 6, *de eo qui duxit in matr.*), the decorum of

marriages (capp. 3, 5, 8, *de sponsal. et matr.* Trid. sess xxiv. cap. 3, *de reform. matr.*), the inviolability of religion (cap. 7, *de divor.*), to be placed under proper safeguard. In fine, she has fortified that divine institution so strongly and with such prudent laws, that no one can be a just judge of things who does not understand that even with regard to the subject of marriages the Church is the best guardian and protector of the human race; and that her wisdom has victoriously survived both the flight of time, the injuries of men, and the innumerable vicissitudes of states.

But, by the efforts of the enemy of the human race, there are not wanting those who, as they ungratefully repudiate the other benefits of redemption, in the same way either despise or altogether ignore the restitution and perfection of marriage. It is the disgrace of certain of the ancients that they were hostile to marriage in some respects; but much more perniciously do those in our own time err who would entirely pervert its nature now that it has been made perfect and complete in all its elements and parts. Of which the cause is chiefly to be found in this, that the minds of many, being imbued with the opinions of a false philosophy and a corrupt habit of mind, bear nothing so ill as to submit and obey; and they labor with the greatest bitterness in order that not only individuals, but families, and indeed the whole human race, may proudly despise the authority of God. But since the fount and origin of the family, and all human society, consists in marriage, they will in no way allow it to be under the jurisdiction of the Church; nay, they endeavor to cast it down from all sanctity, and to drive it into the narrow circle of those things which have been instituted by human authors, and are regulated and administered by the civil law of nations. Whence it necessarily followed that they have attributed to the rulers of the state all jurisdiction over marriage, and granted none to the Church; and if she at any time exercised power of that kind they affirm that this was done by the indulgence of rulers, or unjustly. But now they say it is time that those who rule the state should bravely vindicate their rights, and should determine to direct according to their own will all matters relating to marriage. Hence have arisen what are called *civil marriages*; hence laws enacted concerning the causes which constitute an impediment to marriage; hence judicial sentences on conjugal contracts, as to whether they have been entered upon rightly or wrongly. Lastly we see every possible power of legislating and judging on this subject taken away from the Church with so much determination that no account is any longer taken either of her divine power or of the provident laws under which all the nations, to whom Christian wisdom brought the light of civilization, lived so many years.

But the naturalists and all those who, specially professing to worship the deity of the state, are striving to disturb entire commonwealths with these doctrines, cannot avoid the reproach of falsehood. For since marriage has God for its author, and since it has been even from the beginning a shadowing forth of the incarnation of the Word of God, therefore there is in it something sacred and religious, not adven-

titious but innate, not received from men but implanted by nature. Wherefore Innocent III. (cap. 8, *de divort.*) and Honorius III. (cap. 11, *de transact.*), our predecessors, were enabled to say, not unjustly nor rashly, that the sacrament of marriage exists both among the faithful and among infidels. We call to witness also the monuments of antiquity, and the customs and institutions of those nations which were the most cultivated and excelled in a more refined knowledge of right and equity, in all of whose minds it was a settled and foregone conclusion that the idea of marriage was connected with religion and sanctity. For this reason marriages amongst them were frequently accustomed to be performed with religious ceremonies, with the authority of the pontiffs, with the ministry of priests, so great an influence even on minds ignorant of Divine Revelation had the nature of things, the memory of their origin, the conscience of the human race!—

Wherefore marriage, being by its own nature and meaning sacred, it is consistent that it should be regulated and governed, not by the command of rulers, but by the divine authority of the Church, which alone possesses authority in sacred things. Then we must consider the dignity of the sacrament, by the addition of which the marriages of Christians have become in the highest degree ennobled. And, by the will of Christ, the Church alone can and ought to legislate and decide concerning sacraments, so that it is out of the question to attempt to transfer any, even the smallest part, of her power to the governors of the state. Finally, there is great weight, great force in history, by which we are clearly taught that the legislative and judicial power of which we speak was wont to be freely and continually exercised by the Church, even in those times when it is vainly and foolishly pretended that the chiefs of the state were consenting and conniving thereto. For how incredible and absurd it is to suppose that Christ Our Lord condemned the deep-rooted custom of polygamy and of repudiation by a power delegated to Him by the governor of the province or by the ruler of the Jews; or, in like manner, that the Apostle Paul declared divorces and incestuous marriages to be unlawful with the consent or by the tacit authority of Tiberius, of Caligula, or of Nero! Nor can any sane man be persuaded that so many laws were enacted by the Church regarding the sanctity and stability of marriage (Can. Apost., 16, 17, 18), and regarding marriages between slaves and free women (Philosophum. Oxon., 1851), by authority derived from the Roman emperors, the deadliest enemies of the Christian name, who desired nothing more earnestly than to extirpate by violence and blood the growing religion of Christ; more especially as the law which proceeded from the Church differed so widely from the civil law that Ignatius the Martyr (Epist. ad Polycarp. cap. 5), Justin (Apolog. mai., n. 15), Athenagoras (Legat. pro Christian., nn. 32, 33), and Tertullian (De coron. milit., cap. 13) publicly denounced as immoral, and even adulterous, marriages which, nevertheless, the imperial laws allowed. But when all power came into the hands of the Christian emperors, the Supreme Pontiffs and the bishops, assembled in council, continued always, with the same liberty and the

same knowledge of their own right, to command and to forbid in matrimonial affairs as seemed to them to be useful and in conformity with the requirements of the times, no matter how inconsistent it might be with the civil institutions of the day. No one is ignorant that many rules were made on the subject of impediments arising from obligations, vows, disparity of worship, consanguinity, crime, or public decency by the prelates of the Church at the Councils of Elvira (De Aguirre, Conc. Hispan, tom. i., can. 13, 15, 16, 17), Arles (Harduin., Act. Concil., tom. i., can. 11), Chalcedon (Harduin., Act. Concil., tom. i, can. 16), Milevis (Harduin., Act. Concil., tom. i., can. 17), and other councils, which frequently are far different from the decrees sanctioned by the imperial law. And so far were princes from claiming any power for themselves in the matter of Christian marriages, that they declared and acknowledged that that power, in all its plenitude, was vested in the Church. In fact, Honorius, Theodosius the Younger, and Justinian (Novel. 137) did not hesitate to admit that in matters which concerned marriage they had no right to do anything except as the guardians and defenders of the sacred canons. And if they made any decrees regarding impediments to marriage, they of their own accord explained the reason to be that they had taken this upon themselves by the permission and authority of the Church (Fejer, *Matrim. ex. instit. Christ.*; Pesth. 1835), whose decision they were accustomed to ask for and reverently to receive in disputes concerning the legitimacy of children (cap. 3, *de ordin. cognit.*), concerning divorces (cap. 3, *de divort.*), and, in fine, all matters having any kind of relation to the matrimonial bond (cap. 13, *qui filii sint legit.*). Wherefore it was most justly decreed by the Council of Trent that the Church has power "to define the impediments which make matrimony void, and that matrimonial causes belong to the jurisdiction of ecclesiastical judges." (Trid., sess. xxiv., can. 4.)

Nor let any one be led astray by that distinction so sedulously urged by regalists, according to which they separate the nuptial contract from the sacrament, in order that, while judgment respecting the sacraments is reserved to the Church, they may give over the contract to the authority and decision of the civil power. For a distinction, or rather a disjunction, of this nature cannot be established; inasmuch as it is manifest that in Christian matrimony it is not possible to separate the contract from the sacrament, and, therefore, that there cannot be a true and legitimate contract without its being, on that very account, a sacrament. For Christ Our Lord raised matrimony to the dignity of a sacrament; and matrimony is the contract itself, provided only that it be lawfully made. In addition to which, matrimony is a sacrament for this reason, that it is a sacred sign conveying grace, and presenting an image of the mystic nuptials of Christ with the Church. But the form and figure of these is expressed by that bond of perfect unity by which man and wife are joined together, and which is nothing else but matrimony itself. Therefore it is evident that every lawful marriage between Christians is in and by itself a sacrament; and nothing can be more opposed to truth than that the sacrament is but an ornamental addition,

or a character imparted from without, which may be separated and disjoined from the contract at will. Wherefore it is neither established by reasoning nor proved by historical evidence that authority over Christian marriage is rightly given to the state. And if in this matter the right of others has been violated, no one can say that it has been violated by the Church.

And would that the teachings of the naturalists, so full of falsehood and injustice, were not equally fruitful in mischiefs and calamities. But it is easy to perceive what evil the profaning of marriages brings about, and how much it is likely to inflict upon the whole of human society. For in the beginning it was divinely ordained that we should find those things instituted by God and by nature more useful and more salutary in proportion as they remain whole and immutable in their original condition ; since God the Creator of all things well knew what was expedient for the establishment and preservation of each, and so ordained all by His will and judgment that each should have its appropriate development. But if the temerity or the wickedness of men seek to change and to disturb the order of providence, then indeed even things which have been most wisely and most advantageously instituted begin to be injurious, or cease to be beneficial, either because by change they have lost the power of doing good, or because it is the will of God to punish in this manner the pride and audacity of men. They who deny the sanctity of marriage, and cast it, stripped of all sanctity, into the order of profane things, pervert the fundamental principles of nature, and, while they fight against the counsels of divine providence, at the same time to the extent of their power destroy its work. Wherefore it is not wonderful that from such insane and impious attempts there springs a crop of evils than which nothing can be more pernicious to the salvation of souls and the safety of the state.

If it be considered to what the divine institution of marriage tends, it will be very evident that it was the will of God to comprise in it the most abundant sources of public happiness and security. And plainly, marriages, besides that they are intended for the propagation of the human race, tend to make the life of married people more virtuous and more happy ; and this in several ways, as, by mutual assistance to relieve necessities, by constant and faithful love, by the community of all possessions, and by the celestial grace that goes forth from the sacrament. And the same causes are most powerful in promoting the welfare of families ; for marriages, as long as they are in accordance with nature and fitly correspond with the designs of God, possess a power to confirm a spirit of concord among parents, to promote the good education of children, to temper paternal power by proposing the example of the power of God, to make sons obedient to their parents, servants to their masters. From such marriages states may justly expect a progeny of citizens who will be animated with virtuous sentiments, imbued with the love and fear of God, and will deem it their duty to obey just and legitimate authority, to love all, to injure none.

These fruits, so many and so great, holy matrimony produced so

long as it retained the attributes of sanctity, of unity, and of perpetuity, from which it derived all its fertile and salutary force ; nor can it be doubted that it would still have produced similar and equal results if at all times and in all places it had been in the power and care of the Church, which is at all times the most faithful guardian and vindicator of those attributes. But because, ere long, in various places the law of men was made to take the place of the divine and natural law, not only did that most exalted form and conception of marriage which nature had impressed, and, as it were, engraved, on the minds of men, begin to be obliterated, but even in Christian marriages its power, the source of such great blessings, was, through the wickedness of men, greatly weakened. For what benefit can nuptial unions confer from which the Christian religion, which is the parent of all good, and which fosters the greatest virtues, exciting and urging to everything which adorns a generous and exalted soul, is banished ? When it is put aside and rejected marriage must needs be made a slave to the corrupt nature of man and the passions, which are the worst of rulers, protected only by the weak defence of natural virtue. Manifold evil, derived from this source, has resulted not only to private families, but to nations also. For when the salutary fear of God is removed, and when that alleviation of troubles which is to be found nowhere more effectual than in the Christian religion is taken away, it often and naturally happens that the duties and obligations of marriage appear almost intolerable ; and many inordinately desire the loosening of the bond, which they imagine to have been tied by human law and choice, if difference of disposition, or quarrels, or infidelity on the part of one or the other, or mutual consent, or any other cause make them think it expedient. And if the law denies satisfaction to the wantonness of their desires, they exclaim that the laws are unjust, inhuman, and opposed to the rights of free citizens, and that some provision must be made for their abolition and the introduction of milder laws to facilitate divorce.

But the legislators of our times, while they profess themselves tenacious and studious of the same principles of right, cannot even, though they desire it ever so much, guard themselves from that wickedness of men of which we spoke ; wherefore the times must be yielded to, and the faculty of divorce granted. History herself declares the same thing. For, to pass by other instances, towards the end of the last century, in that conflagration rather than disturbance of France, when all society was profaned and God was set aside, it was decided that the severance of married couples should be ratified by the laws. And many wish those same laws to be revived at this time, because they would have God and the Church driven from our midst, and removed from intercourse with human society, foolishly supposing that the last remedy for the great increase of corruption in morals is to be sought in laws of this description.

It is scarcely necessary to say of how much evil divorce is productive. It is the fruitful cause of mutable marriage compacts ; it diminishes mutual affection ; it supplies a pernicious stimulus to unfaithfulness ; it

is injurious to the care and education of children ; it gives occasion to the breaking up of domestic society ; it scatters the seed of discord among families ; it lessens and degrades the dignity of women, who incur the danger of being abandoned when they shall have subserved the lust of their husbands. And since nothing tends so effectually as the corruption of morals to ruin families and undermine the strength of kingdoms, it may easily be perceived that divorce is especially hostile to the prosperity of families and states ; for divorce springs from the corrupt morals of nations, and, as experience teaches, opens the way and the door to more vicious habits of private and public life. And these evils will appear to be all the more serious if we consider that no restraint will be strong enough to confine the faculty of divorce, when once conceded, within fixed and foreseen limits. The force of example is very great, and greater still that of lust. From these exciting causes it must result that the desire of divorce, daily creeping on further, will invade the minds of a large number of persons, like a malady spread by contagion, or a flood of water that has burst its barriers.

These things surely are clear of themselves, but they become clearer by recalling past events. As soon as the way for divorce began to be rendered safe by law, dissensions, jealousies, separations enormously increased, and so shameful a manner of living was arrived at that those very persons who had been the defenders of such separations repented of what they had done, and unless they had in time sought a remedy in laws of a contrary character there would have been cause for fear lest the commonwealth itself should rush headlong to destruction. The ancient Romans are said to have looked with horror on the first example of divorce ; but ere long the sense of honesty began to be blunted in their minds, modesty with its controlling power to die out, and nuptial fidelity to be violated with so great license that what we read in some writers seems to have a striking semblance of truth, namely, that women had become accustomed to count years, not by the change of consuls, but by the change of husbands. In like manner among Protestants, at first, indeed, the laws had sanctioned divorce for certain causes, and those, to say the truth, not many in number ; but it has been found that these causes have, through the near connection of things resembling one another, increased to such an extent among the Germans, Americans, and others, that they whose understandings were not blunted considered the boundless depravation of morals and the insufferable rashness of the laws as deeply to be lamented. Nor was it otherwise in states called Catholic, in which, if at any time the severance of marriage ties was admitted, the multitude of inconveniences which ensued far exceeded the expectations of legislators. For the wickedness of very many persons led them to turn their minds to all sorts of malice and fraud, and by means of cruelty, by injuries, by adulteries, to invent causes for dissolving with impunity that bond of matrimonial union of which they were tired ; and this with so great detriment to public honesty that all judged it necessary that the laws should as soon as possible be amended. And who will doubt but that the laws favoring divorce will be followed

by wretched and calamitous results wherever they may happen to be revived in our own age? Certainly the contrivances or decrees of men have not the power to change the natural character and conformation of things; wherefore they bring a small amount of wisdom to bear on the public welfare who think that the genuine theory of marriage can be perverted with impunity, and, setting aside all sanctity of religion and of sacrament, seem to wish to disfigure and deform matrimony more shamefully than even the institutions of the heathen were wont to do. And, therefore, unless their counsels change, families and society will constantly have to fear for themselves lest they be hurled most miserably into that universal strife and conflict which has long since been proposed by the flagitious bands of socialists and communists. Hence it is clear how unsuitable and absurd it is to expect public welfare from divorce, which will issue rather in the certain dissolution of society.

It must, therefore, be confessed that the Catholic Church has consulted best for the common good of all people in guarding with constant attention the sanctity and perpetuity of marriage. Nor is little gratitude due to her for having openly remonstrated against the civil laws that for a hundred years past have been sinning in this particular (Pius VI., epist. ad episc. Lucion., 28 Maii, 1793; Pius VII., litter. encycl. die 17 Febr. 1809, et Const. dat. die 19 Jul. 1817; Pius VIII., litt. encycl. die 29 Maii, 1829; Gregorius XVI., Const. dat. die 15 Augusti, 1832; Pius IX., alloc. habit. die 22 Sept. 1852); for having smitten with anathema the pernicious heresy of Protestants concerning divorce and repudiation (Trid., sess., xxiv., can. 5, 7); for having in many ways condemned the dissolution of marriages practiced by the Greeks (Concil. Floren., et Instr. Eug. IV. ad Armenos; Bened. XIV., Const. *Etsi pastoralis*, 6 Maii, 1742); for having decreed those nuptials to be null and void which were contracted under the condition that they might at some time or other be dissolved (cap. 7, *de condit. appos.*); lastly, for having even from the earliest ages repudiated the imperial laws which perniciously favored divorce and the breaking off of the marriage contract (Hieron., epist. 79 ad Ocean; Ambros., lib. viii., in cap. 16 Lucæ, n. 5; August., de nuptiis, cap. 10). In truth, whenever the Supreme Pontiffs resisted most powerful princes demanding with threats to have divorces granted by themselves ratified by the Church, they are to be regarded as having combated not only for the integrity of religion but also for the security of the human race. On which account all posterity admires the proofs of an invincible mind afforded by Nicholas I. in conflict with Lothaire; by Urban II. and Paschal II. struggling against Philip I., King of France; by Celestine III. and Innocent III. against Alfonso of Leon and Philip II. of France; by Clement VII. and Paul III. against Henry VIII., and lastly by the holy and brave Pontiff, Pius VII., against Napoleon I., uplifted by prosperity and the greatness of his empire.

This being the case, all rulers and administrators of public affairs, if they wished to follow reason and wisdom, and to be really useful to the people, ought to have preferred to let the sacred laws of matrimony remain intact, and to apply the proffered assistance of the Church to the

guardianship of morals and the prosperity of families, rather than to cast upon the Church itself the suspicion of hostility, and charge it falsely and unjustly with the violation of civil rights.

And that all the more, because, as the Catholic Church can in no respect depart from religious duty and defence of its rights, so is it habitually inclined to kindness and indulgence in all things which can be made to consist with the integrity of its rights and the sanctity of its duties. For which reason it has never determined anything respecting matrimony without having due regard to the state of the community and to the condition of populations; nor has it on one occasion only, mitigated, as far as it could, the prescriptions of its own laws when there were just and grave causes for such a modification. The Church itself likewise does not ignore or deny that the sacrament of marriage, since it is directed towards the preservation and increase of human society, has a relationship and intimacy with human matters, which are consequences, indeed, of matrimony, but belong to the civil order; and the rulers of the state rightly take cognizance and judge of these. But no one doubts that Jesus Christ, the Founder of the Church, willed the sacred power to be distinct from the civil power, and each power to be free and unhampered in the conduct of its own affairs; yet with this addition, which is expedient for each and for the interests of all men, namely, that there should be a union and concord between them, and that in those things which are, though in different ways, matters of common right and judgment, the one to which human affairs are committed should depend suitably and fittingly on the other, to which are intrusted the things of Heaven. But in an agreement, or harmony, as it were, of this description is contained not only the best mode of operation of each of the two powers, but also the most opportune and efficacious means of helping the human race in what appertains to the conduct of human life and the hope of everlasting salvation. For, as we showed in former Encyclical Letters, the intelligence of men, if it agrees with Christian faith, is much ennobled and comes forth much better armed for the avoidance and repulsion of error, and faith in its turn borrows no small assistance from intelligence; so, in like manner, if the civil authority agrees amicably with the sacred power of the Church, a great increase of usefulness accrues of necessity to both. For the dignity of the one is amplified, and under the guidance of religion the government will never be unjust; while to the other are supplied protection and defence for the public good of the faithful. Therefore, moved by the consideration of these things, as we have at other times earnestly, so now again at the present time we urgently exhort princes and men in authority to concord and friendship; and we are the first to extend to them, as it were, our right hand with paternal benevolence, offering the assistance of our supreme power, which is the more necessary at this time in proportion as the right of sovereign rule is, in the opinion of men, weakened, as if it had received a wound. For the minds of multitudes being inflamed with riotous liberty, and casting off with nefarious boldness every restraint of government, even

the most legitimate, public safety requires that men should associate to prevent the injury of both powers, injury which impends not merely over the Church, but also over civil society itself.

But while we strongly advise a friendly union of wills and dispositions, and pray God, the Prince of Peace, that He would infuse the love of concord into the minds of all men, we cannot refrain, Venerable Brethren, from exhorting yourselves more and more to use your diligence, your zeal and vigilance, which we know to be very great. As far as you can attain it by efforts and by your authority, strive with diligence that among the people intrusted to your fidelity the entire and uncorrupted doctrine be retained which Christ the Lord and the apostolic interpreters of the heavenly will have delivered, and which the Catholic Church herself has religiously preserved and commanded the faithful in Christ to preserve through all ages.

Take especial care of this, that the people abound in precepts of Christian wisdom, and always retain in memory that marriage was instituted in the beginning, not by the will of man, but by the authority and command of God, and was sanctioned entirely under this law, that it should be of one to one; and that Christ, the author of the new covenant, translated that alliance into a sacrament, and, as far as regards the bond, ascribed to His Church the lawgiving and judicial authority. In which matter the greatest care must be taken lest the mind be led into error by the fallacious conclusions of adversaries, who would take away this power from the Church. In like manner it ought to be recognized by all, that if any union of man and woman among the faithful of Christ be contracted without the sacrament it is wanting in the force and character of a true marriage; and although it be effected in agreement with the civil laws, yet it can have no greater value than that of a rite or custom introduced by the civil law; but it must also be remembered that such things only can be ordered and administered by the civil law which are the consequences of marriage in the civil order, and which it is evident cannot be produced except a true and legitimate cause for them, namely, a nuptial bond, really exists. It is, in the highest degree, of importance that the married should fully understand and recognize the truth of these things; which ought indeed to be accepted and understood, so that they may in this matter comply with the laws; for the Church does not refuse, but on the contrary wills and hopes that the due effects of marriage should be preserved intact in all respects, and that no detriment may be entailed on the offspring. In such confusion of opinions, however, which daily advance, this also is necessary to be known, that it is not in the power of any one to dissolve the bond of a marriage solemnized and consummated among Christians; and that they are guilty of a crime who, being man and wife, whatever cause may be alleged, wish to entangle themselves in a new matrimonial bond before the first is broken by death. But if things have gone so far that living together seems to be insupportable any longer, then indeed the Church allows one to live apart from the other, and all care being taken and remedies applied to the condition of the

married couple, she studies how she may mitigate the inconveniences of separation, nor does she ever cease to labor for the re-establishment of concord, or despair of bringing it about. But these are extremities to which it would be easy not to descend if married persons were not actuated by lust, but, having duly considered both the duties and the elevated motives of matrimony, came to it with proper dispositions, and wedlock were not preceded by a continuous series of offences displeasing to God. To sum up all in a few words, marriages will be blessed with peaceful and quiet constancy if the wedded pair draw their breath and life from the power of religion, of whose gift it comes that the mind is strong and unconquerable, and by whose existence personal faults, if such exist, discrepancy of habits and dispositions, the weight of maternal cares, the toil and anxiety about the education of children, the attendant labors of existence, and adverse circumstances may be borne, not only with moderation, but even willingly and gladly.

Care ought also to be taken lest alliances be lightly sought with those who are strangers to the Catholic name and faith, for it can scarcely be hoped that minds which are at variance in respect of religious doctrine should be in accord on other matters. Indeed it is most evident that marriages of this kind should be avoided from the fact of their giving occasion to forbidden communion in sacred things; they create danger to the religion of a Catholic spouse, they are a hindrance to the good education of the children, and very frequently they dispose the mind to become accustomed to take equal account of all religions, and to lose sight of the distinction between true and false. In the last place, since we thoroughly understand that no one ought to be an alien from our charity, we commend those, Venerable Brethren, to your authority, faith, and piety, who, being indeed extremely wretched, are carried away by the tide of their lusts, and, being altogether unmindful of their own salvation, live contrary to law and right not united in a bond of lawful wedlock. Let your skill and diligence be employed in recalling such to their duty; and do you in every way strive, both by yourselves and with the interposition of good men, that they may perceive that they have acted wickedly, that they may do penance for their sin, and may turn their minds seriously towards proper nuptials celebrated with Catholic rites.

You easily perceive, Venerable Brethren, that these instructions and precepts respecting Christian marriage, which we have resolved to communicate to you, pertain strictly no less to the preservation of civil society than to the everlasting salvation of men. May God grant, therefore, that the more weight and importance these instructions have, the more they may find everywhere minds docile and prompt to obey. On this account let us all alike, with suppliant and humble prayer, implore the aid of the Blessed and Immaculate Virgin Mary, that, by exciting minds to the obedience of faith, she may show herself to men as their mother and helper. Nor let us implore with less earnestness Peter and Paul, the princes of the Apostles, the conquerors of superstition, the sowers of the seed of truth, that they may preserve the human race from the deluge of returning errors by their most powerful patronage.

Meanwhile, as pledge of heavenly gifts and witness of Our singular good-will, We from the heart impart to you all, Venerable Brethren, and to the people intrusted to your vigilance, Our apostolic benediction.

Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, on the tenth day of February, in the year 1880, the second year of Our Pontificate.

LEO PP. XIII.

LETTER TO HIS HOLINESS LEO XIII.

[SOME months ago we published in the REVIEW the magnificent Encyclical of Our Holy Father, in which he urged the bishops of the Catholic world to take suitable measures for restoring the study of St. Thomas and his teachings in their seminaries of theology and wherever outside of them secular youth receives philosophical instruction. To this our American bishops, not content with the simple obedience they uniformly render to all mandates, counsels, even mere wishes, of the Holy See, have given their warmest assent and adhesion of heart and soul, and have expressed in reply to the Holy Father not only their willingness, but their eagerness to second his intentions to the best of their power. We have received such urgent requests from more than one source to put on record in the REVIEW this adhesion of the American Episcopate to the teachings of Rome touching St. Thomas, that we cannot but comply. Consequently we give below the Letter of the Archbishops and Bishops of the provinces of New York, Boston, and Philadelphia. All the other prelates have, no doubt, singly or conjointly notified the Holy Father of their intention to be guided by his counsel and authority in this matter. But this is the only document that has appeared in print so far. We take it, with its translation, from the Philadelphia *Catholic Standard* of March 20th, 1880.]

BEATISSIME PATER: Litteras Tuas mense Augusto superioris anni datas non sine maxima animi laetitia perlegimus. Iis enim, quod jampridem bonorum omnium vota postulabant, Episcopos hortaris ac mones ut Clericorum aliorumque doctorum virorum studium in theologicis ac philosophicis disciplinis ad D. Thomae normam tradendis excitent; atque auream sanctissimi hujus magistri doctrinam, sicubi neglecta fuerit, revocandam ac restituendam et quam latissime propagandam curent. Quod non solum maximas Ecclesiae utilitates pariet, sed etiam scientiis omnibus quotquot apud homines excoluntur haud parum profuturum esse arbitramur. Omnes enim artissimo quodam inter se vinculo colligantur, neque sine rectae philosophiae principiis atque usu aut satis intelligi aut apte doceri possunt. Quamobrem si saperent suaeque mentis essent Tibi gratias et haberent et agerent maximas etiam illi homines qui, neglecto rerum divinarum studio iis potissimum scientiis quae ex naturae pervestigatione humanoque ingenio hauriuntur, sese totos tradiderunt.

Certissimam enim viam et rationem etiam ipsis ostendisti, quâ unâ veros optabilesque progressus humana quoque scientia sit habitura.

Nos vero. Beatissime Pater, qui Principis Apostolorum Haeredem ac summum Fidei Magistrum in Te veneramus, cum litteras Tuas pervolveremus, non solum vim ac gravitatem orationis Tuae, qualis profecto Petrum in monendis atque erudiendis fratribus decet admirati sumus, sed etiam singularem providentiam sapientissimumque consilium quod in iisdem litteris elucet. Perspexisti et dilucide docuisti ingruentibus undique erroribus occurri omnino non posse, nisi denuo ad veterem philosophandi normam Catholicorum scholae dirigantur. Sane, quod ipse, Beatissime Pater, sapientissime commemorasti, ex quo homines petulanti ingenio effraenensque in disputando licentiae cupidi vetera Patrum instituta ducemque tutissimum Doctorem Angelicum deseruerent, dici vix potest quam multa ac teterrima errorum monstra quasi agmine facto in philosophorum scholas irruperint. Hinc oppugnari ac labefactari doctrinae praeteritorum saeculorum, non eae tantum quae captum rationis excedunt quasque nobis Deus per Filium suum sponte revelaverat, sed illae quoque quae apud omnes etiam barbaros vigent, quas ratio ipsa avide excipit comprobaturque, quae denique in omnium animis ita inhaerent ut eas vel natura quasi inditas habeamus vel pene cum lacte nutricis hausisse videamur.

Atque hujus quidem miserrimae rerum conditionis Beatissime Pater, quod non sine lacrymis fateri cogimur, exempla domestica non desunt. Cum enim apud eos qui in hac regione maximo Catholicae unitatis beneficio infeliciter carent philosophia aut fere nullâ aut omnino perversâ ratione pertractetur, plurimos videre licet qui in dies prima illa religionis ac morum principia dediscunt quae vel feri ac silvestres homines, natura duce, agnoscunt. Pauci quidem adhuc sunt, quod uni clementissimi Dei misericordiae acceptum referimus, qui impietatem hanc suam in vulgus propalare aliosque docere audeant. Sed valde urget nos timor, ne horum numerus paullatim augeatur. Dum hoc vident, dolent animoque anguntur ceteri qui à scelere impietatis in Deum morumque corruptela abhorrent. Sed nullum, eheu! habent in suâ aut religione aut philosophiâ tanti mali remedium. Immo licentiae et impietati haud obscure patrocinantur ea ipsa principia, quibus utrique adversus Ecclesiam Dei et Catholicam veritatem tueri se solent. Utinam Petrum Apostolorum Principem lapidemque Christianae veritatis angularem in Te, Beatissime Pater, loquentem et docentem audire vellent! Secus enim in arcendo errore inermes perpetuo sint oportet. Neque unquam certis argumentis potentur quibus, quasi validissimis telis, Dei humanaeque societatis hostium crescentem in dies audaciam et furorem retundant.

Quod autem ad nos attinet, Beatissime Pater, promittimus nos omni quo possumus studio, Tuis hortatibus obsecundaturos. Iam quidem plurimis in scholis apud nos praeclara D. Thomae volumina eam obtinere auctoritatem, ut ad ea quasi normam doctores omnia exigant discipulisque tradant. Curabimus vero, juvante Deo, ut nulla sit in posterum nostrarum dioeceseon schola, nullum seminarium ad juvenes in disciplinis

philosophicis et theologicis instituendos, in quo D. Thomae doctrina non ex rivulis sed ex ipso fonte derivata non plenissime imbuantur.

Gratulamur igitur Tibi, Leo Pontifex Maxime, quod antecessorum Tuorum vestigiis insistens gravissimis ac magnificentissimis Verbis Tuis Thomam Aquinatem, sanctissimum ac doctissimum virum in pristinum honorem revocasti atque adeo tam philosophiae quam theologiae Catholicae, immo etiam scientiarum omnium profectui et augmento sapienter consulisti. Iterumque pollicemur nos monitis et hortamentis Tuis hac in re nullo unquam tempore defuturos.

Quod pium voluntatis nostrae propositum ut ratum habeas Tuaque Apostolica benedictione benigne confirmes enixe obsecramus.

Sanctitatis Tuae Filii Obsequentissimi,

JOANNES CARD McCLOSKEY,

Archiepiscopus Neo Eboracensis,

JOANNES LOUGHLIN,

Episcopus Brooklynensis,

BERNARDUS MCQUAID,

Episcopus Roffensis,

STEPHANUS V. RYAN,

Episcopus Buffalensis,

FRANCISCUS MCNIERY,

Episcopus Albanensis,

EDGAR P. WADHAMS,

Episcopus Ogdensburgensis,

MICHAEL A. CORRIGAN,

Episcopus Nevarcensis,

JOANNES J. WILLIAMS,

Archiepiscopus Bostoniensis,

LUDOVICUS DE GOESBRIAND,

Episcopus Burlingtonensis,

PATRITIUS T. O'REILLY,

Episcopus Campifontis,

THOMAS F. HENDRICKEN,

Episcopus Providentiensis,

JACOBUS A. HEALY,

Episcopus Portlandensis,

LAURENTIUS J. McMAHON,

Episcopus Hartfordensis,

JACOBUS F. WOOD,

Archiepiscopus Philadelphiensis,

TOBIAS MULLEN,

Episcopus Eriensis,

GULIELMUS O'HARA,

Episcopus Scrantonensis,

JEREMIAS F. SHANAHAN,

Episcopus Harrisburgensis,

JOANNES J. TUIGG,

Episcopus Pittsburgensis et Administrator Alleghenensis.

[TRANSLATION.]

MOST HOLY FATHER: It was not without a deep feeling of joy that we read thy letters bearing date of August of the past year. For in the same—what all good men had long and anxiously desired—thou warnest and encouragest all bishops to excite the zealous co-operation of the clergy and other men of learning in order that philosophy and theology may be taught according to the standard of St. Thomas, to do what is in their power to bring back and restore the golden doctrines of this most holy teacher wherever it may have fallen into disuse or neglect, and to see that it be diffused everywhere if possible. And this, we feel sure, will not only be highly beneficial to the Church, but will be likewise of no little advantage to all the sciences that are cultivated by mankind. For these are all knit together by the closest ties, and can neither be well understood nor properly taught without the principles of a correct philosophy. Therefore it would be only just that even those who have no concern for the study of sacred things, but are wholly immersed in those sciences that are based on the observation of nature or intellectual investigation, should feel grateful, were they but wise and right-minded, and even express their thanks for this timely warning. For to them likewise thou hast disclosed the only path by which even purely human science may hope to attain such progress as is real and to be desired.

But we, Most Holy Father, we who in thy person reverence the heir of the Prince of the Apostles and the Supreme Teacher of faith, in perusing thy letters have found just reason to admire, not only the weight and power of thy words, but also the admirable foresight and most wise counsel that shine forth in the aforesaid letters. Thou hast clearly laid down, what thy wisdom has so well discerned, that Catholic schools can oppose the errors that are making headway on every side in no more effectual way than by a return to philosophy of the old pattern. Indeed, nor has it escaped mention in thy letters, ever since men bold, self-willed, and craving unbridled license of discussion have abandoned the teachings of our fathers, and that most safe guide, the Angelic Doctor, it would be hard to enumerate the many and monstrous errors that, like enemies in battle array, have invaded the schools of philosophy. Hence the repeated assaults meant to weaken and overthrow the teachings of past ages, not only those beyond the comprehension of reason and graciously revealed by God through his Son, but those also that are found even amongst barbarous nations, truths that when first heard reason eagerly receives and welcomes, and which are so congenial to the human soul that we seem either to possess them by instinct of nature, or to have drawn them in with our mother's milk in infancy.

Of this sad condition of things, Most Holy Father, and we say it sorrowing, examples at home are not wanting. For, whereas in this country among those who are unhappily deprived of the blessing of Catholic unity either no philosophy is studied, or that only which is of

distorted and perverse kind, we have the misfortune to behold many who, day by day, are unlearning those first principles of religion and morals which even the rude men of the forest have been taught by the guidance of nature alone. As yet there are but few, and this we ascribe only to the goodness of an all-merciful God, who have the boldness to spread before the world their impiety, and teach it to their fellow-men. But, to our grief, it is to be feared that the number of such teachers is growing by degrees. This state of things, it is true, is a source of trouble and affliction to others who yet retain their abhorrence of impiety in religion and of corruption in morals. But alas! in the shreds of religion or of philosophy that they have preserved, they can find no remedy for so great an evil. On the contrary, both religion and license find no little support in the very principles by which both parties alike try to defend themselves against the Church of God and Catholic truth. Oh! that they would but give ear to Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and who is, likewise, the corner-stone of Christian truth, speaking and teaching through thee, Most Holy Father. For otherwise they must be ever defenceless in the combat against error. Never can they get possession of those solid arguments by which, as by unfailing weapons, they will be enabled to hurl back the attacks, daily increasing in boldness and fury, of the enemies of God and of human society.

As regards ourselves, Most Holy Father, we promise most earnestly to follow thy exhortations. Already in very many of our schools the glorious writings of St. Thomas possess such authority that they have become the standard for all, teachers and scholars. And with God's help we will make further provision, so that hereafter there shall be in our dioceses no seminary, no school for philosophical or theological studies in which our youth shall not be fully imbued with the teaching of St. Thomas, and that derived, not from rivulets, but from the very fountain-head.

Justly, then, may we congratulate thee, great Pontiff, Leo! for this that, in perfect unison with the will and deed of thy predecessors, thy great and noble words have re-established in his former place of honor that most holy and learned man, Thomas of Aquin, and have thus wisely consulted for the progress and improvement of Catholic philosophy and theology, and, indeed, of all science.

Again we renew our promise never to forget thy words of admonition and encouragement. Which good purpose of our will we earnestly beseech thee to accept, and to confirm the same by thy Apostolic Benediction.

Of Thy Holiness's Most Devoted Children,

JOHN CARDINAL McCLOSKEY,

Archbishop of New York.

JOHN LOUGHLIN,

Bishop of Brooklyn.

BERNARD McQUAID,

Bishop of Rochester.

STEPHEN V. RYAN,

Bishop of Buffalo.

FRANCIS MCNIERNY,
Bishop of Albany.

EDGAR P. WADHAMS,
Bishop of Ogdensburg.

MICHAEL A. CORRIGAN,
Bishop of Newark.

JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
Archbishop of Boston.

LOUIS DE GOESBRIAND,
Bishop of Burlington.

PATRICK T. O'REILLY,
Bishop of Springfield.

THOMAS F. HENDRICKEN,
Bishop of Providence.

JAMES A. HEALY,
Bishop of Portland.

LAURENCE S. McMAHON,
Bishop of Hartford.

JAMES F. WOOD,
Archbishop of Philadelphia.

TOBIAS MULLEN,
Bishop of Erie.

WILLIAM O'HARA,
Bishop of Scranton.

JEREMIAH F. SHANAHAN,
Bishop of Harrisburg.

JOHN TUIGG,
Bishop of Pittsburgh and Administrator of Alleghany.

BOOK NOTICES.

THE BIBLE OF TO-DAY. A Course of Lectures. By *John W. Chadwick*, Minister of the Second Unitarian Church, in Brooklyn. New York: G. P. Putnam & Sons, 1879.

The lectures which compose this volume were written, as we learn from the preface, for Mr. Chadwick's "people." His object, as he states it, is "to condense into a single volume . . . the best historical and scientific criticism of the separate books of the Bible, and their mutual relations. I am not aware of any other volume which has made exactly this attempt, and it is high time somebody should make it." Why Mr. Chadwick should thus think it necessary for anybody to make the attempt we are entirely unable to discover, since in the very next sentence he expresses doubt of the truth of these results of "the best historical and scientific criticism." The idea which rules him is expressed in two lines on the title-page:

"Out from the heart of nature rolled
The burdens of the Bible old."

It strikes us with wonder that the author and others of his school of disbelief, can have the patience to spend so much time and labor in researches about writings, which according to *their* theories are, in plain English, forgeries and impostures; and that they so strenuously claim to be Christians when, according to their professed belief, the writings which Christians regard as sacred and as a record of divinely revealed truth, are nothing else than a collection of myths and legends, growing out of the fancies, desires, or speculations of men.

It would be impossible within any reasonable limits to present the author's theory of the writings which make up the volume commonly called the Bible. The following statements will give a general idea of his notions of the Old Testament:

"Before the Babylonish captivity there were no *sacred* writings in Judea. There were some laws, and some of the writings of the prophets, and some historical compositions, and some of these, no doubt, were highly valued, but no special character was attached to them, no peculiar authority assigned to them. And this you must remember was about eight hundred years after the time of Moses. Soon after the captivity in the fifth century B. C. the law appeared, and soon after came to be considered sacred. Not long after, it would seem, that Nehemiah made a collection of histories and prophecies, together with the Psalms that had appeared up to this time, not with any idea of putting them on a level with the law, but only to preserve them from destruction. Nevertheless, in course of time they came to be regarded as almost or quite as sacred as the law. Again, as time went on, there appeared other writings, and older ones came to be more regarded for one reason or another, and so somewhat along in the first century before Christ, these were collected, and in another century or two had come to be regarded as almost, or quite as sacred as the *Law* and the *Prophets*—the two former collections. The Old Testament was now complete."

This would be simply ridiculous were it not impious. The reader will note the tone of positive assertion that runs through the statements quoted, and yet when Mr. Chadwick comes to assign definite reasons

for them, he, in effect, acknowledges that he is not able to arrive at any conclusions whatever other than merely speculative ones, and that the infidel critics he follows are all at variance with each other. Christian tradition and that of the Jews respecting the Scripture he holds in supreme contempt. With a wave of his hand, as it were, and without regarding it as necessary to give a reason for so doing, he ignores the belief of the Church, the opinions of her Doctors, the decisions of her Councils as, all alike, childish delusions, and, by the compass of his own infallible judgment, he makes his way with perfect confidence through what, without the guidance of the Church, becomes simply a maze of confused contradictions.

The books composing the Pentateuch, according to this infallible critic, were written at various periods, several hundred years *after* all the prophetic books. Here is a specimen at once of his self-assurance and of his notions:

"First, the *Prophets* also, because they are the bedrock, the hard pan, from which we start to build with any satisfaction or security. We ought to proceed from the known to the unknown, and in good part we know the prophets, who they were and when they wrote, and from their conscious and unconscious testimony we strike out in both directions; into the past behind them; into the future they did so much to form. This is the new criticism. This is the principle . . . which has proved a key to mysteries which have baffled scholarship for half a century, and which revolutionizes the popular conception of the order of the Old Testament ideas, substituting *evolution* for *revelation* as a sufficient explanation of everything we find from *Genesis* to *Malachi*."

Mr. Chadwick then proceeds to explain that by "the prophets" *he* does not mean "the prophets of the Jewish tripartite division of the Old Testament," that *he* means "all the prophets of our English Bible" (including Daniel and Lamentations, and excluding what are known as the earlier Prophets) from Isaiah to Malachi.

It would be interesting as a study of the progress which a mind cut loose from all faith and reverence, and given up to its own delusions, can make in satanic perversions of truth to follow this writer in his statements. It would serve to illustrate, too, the rapid progress of Protestantism downwards into sheer disbelief of everything sacred and divine in Christianity. For our author claims to be a mere exponent of the opinions of the great majority of modern Protestant Biblical critics. Space, however, is not allowed us to enter into details. Suffice it to say that he denies that there was any uniformity or consistency of "views" or of "hopes" among the Prophets; he affirms that they were *not* monotheists; that Jehovah was *not* "to all of them the same God, and the only God of all the universe;" that they did *not* "all accept the same moral standards;" that "they were *not* all haters of idolatry in every form;" that it was *not* "their chief function" "to predict the coming of the Messianic Kingdom, supposed to be identical with Christianity, and of the Messiah, supposed to be identical with Jesus Christ!"

All these ideas Mr. Chadwick summarily dismisses as pure delusions. He places the earlier Prophets on the same plane with "the prophets of Baal and Ashtera and other deities" of the Canaanites, and undertakes to trace resemblances between them. Jehovah, he asserts, was worshipped in the shape of a young bull. "Beginning in nature worship, and in awe and terror at the darker and fiercer aspects of nature, the religion of Israel did not shake off for centuries the spell of early associations. Their God was 'a consuming fire,' a cruel God, and, as such to be worshipped with cruel human sacrifices. The Canaanitish Moloch was his

nearest blood relation. Prophetism in the tenth century, B.C., was a regularly organized system of tyrannicide. The prophets of the eighth century, B.C., are the first prophets who are strict monotheists. For them Yaweh is no longer a mere tribal God. He is the God of all the world But best of all He is a moral being In the eighth century, B.C., there was no Mosaic Law in any modern sense. There were the 'ten words' as they were then called, the ten commandments as we call them, a few precepts and traditions. But the *Pentateuch* in anything like its present form was still far in the future. *Deuteronomy* one hundred years ahead; *Leviticus* and *Numbers* nearly three hundred. Prophetism created *Deuteronomy*. It collected the legends. It wrote the histories. It reflected back the light which it had worn upon the past. But the spiritual monotheism of the eighth century B.C. was no tradition. It was an *evolution*. It was a new *discovery*, a greater one than any that mankind had made before." As for the writings which make up the *Pentateuch* they were not even an "evolution;" they were a "stratification," made up of successive deposits of myths indurated and consolidated in the public mind. "Genesis came after *Deuteronomy* and additions to the *Pentateuch* did not cease until about 300 B.C. The Patriarchs were not real personages, but only mythical personifications of tribal movements. David is a man of cruelty and treachery and lust; a man after Yaweh's own heart and Yaweh was a god after *his* own heart."

The New Testament writings and personages are treated with like impious irreverence. Some few of the epistles were written by the persons whose names they bear, but are nothing more than expressions of their own individual ideas. The Acts of the Apostles is a legendary history composed by some one in the second century. Not one of the Gospels was written by the Evangelists. They were all gotten up for a purpose, an evolution of the views previously prevailing among Christians and an attempt made in the second century to reconcile two antagonistic parties among them. The miracles they recount are mere myths.

Christianity traced back through Judaism to its first beginning started in Fetishism; then developed into more formal idolatry; then into a higher form of nature worship; then into monotheism; and then into the worship of Jesus Christ.

We have given so much space to these impious statements, and placed them on record with great reluctance, yet with the conviction that they would serve a moral purpose in showing the horrid abyss of absurdity and wickedness into which the satanic evolution of the so-called Reformation has fallen. For Mr. Chadwick, throughout, follows avowedly the leading modern non-Catholic Biblical critics. The "good bishop" Colenso, and Dean Stanley, and Dr. George R. Noyes, of Harvard University, and Prof. Robertson Smith, of Aberdeen, and Dr. Samuel Davidson are among the authorities upon whom he relies. It will scarcely be believed, and yet it is a fact, that this mass of atheism and absurdity, setting at utter defiance all history as well as the belief of all true Christians in all ages, is put forth under the pretence of leading "to a better knowledge and appreciation of the Bible." Can barefaced hypocrisy go beyond this, or is a more patent illustration of the truth of St. Paul's words needed?

"For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all impiety and injustice of those men that detain the truth in injustice because that when they had known God, they have not glorified Him as God, nor gave thanks; but became vain in their thoughts, and their foolish heart was darkened. For professing themselves wise they became fools

and as they liked not to have God in their knowledge, God delivered them up to a reprobate sense."

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW AND THE "FAITH OF OUR FOREFATHERS." The case as it stands. By the author of the book. New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1880, pp. 24.

In this little pamphlet Rev. Mr. Stearns, author of the *Faith of Our Forefathers*, attempts in his own peculiar way to reply to what he evidently considers the presumption of those who have ventured to find anything but matter of praise in his book. He seems to think that none but Catholics find fault with him, and in this he wrongs many members even of his own Church, who admire his theology, but think and say that in defending its claims he need not and should not have violated other claims of social decency. He glories in "calling (as he says) a spade a spade;" but this is glory of a very doubtful character. He shares it with many, against whom we are compelled by every principle to close our ears. Nor is it to be confounded with the virtue of truthfulness. They are two different things, and by no means go together. At all events Diogenes and Thersites have never been acknowledged as models of imitation in the Christian Church, above all for those who claim to be Heaven's messengers and heralds of the Gospel.

Mr. Stearns singles out the QUARTERLY, and because it made his work the subject of an article and of a book notice he looks on it as a recognition of the importance and formidable character of his book. He is mistaken. The two *critiques* are from different hands, and had one known that the other was writing he would have laid aside his pen. When they came to the office, as it was found they took different ground, and one did not interfere with the other, both were inserted.

In the beginning of his reply to the article signed "A. de G.," which, in calm, dignified language, pointed out the true character of the *Faith of Our Forefathers*, Rev. Mr. Stearns brings forward extracts in praise of his book from newspapers and ministers of his own sect. The covers of his pamphlet are full of the same thing,—approving letters and notices from ministers and periodicals of many denominations. What do they prove? Nothing. This sort of testimony has become too common to command respect. There is no quack-medicine current, no impostor stalking through the land, that does not parade a host of testimonial letters from ministers of the various sects. To these letters he adds a quotation or two from an English clergyman, Rev. Dr. Littledale, whom, as it suits his purpose, he praises in advance as "by all odds the ablest, and fairest, and calmest of the writers in the Ritualistic school of the Church of England." Now, if Mr. Stearns had just finished reading one of those many books of Dr. Littledale, in which he defends the Real Presence, True Priesthood, Sacrifice of the Mass, and other portions of Catholic belief,—or Romanist idolatry, as it is termed in Episcopalian formularies,—and were he questioned by a friend, or "interviewed" by a reporter, to obtain his real opinion of Dr. Littledale as a controversial writer, would he give Dr. Littledale, without a syllable changed, the character, "ablest, fairest, calmest," that he so unhesitatingly accords him in the pamphlet? It is very unlikely. But would it be consistent with honesty to withhold from Dr. Littledale, writing in favor of Rome (we do not say the encomiums, but), the *character* that is allowed him when writing against Rome. A writer who is able, fair, and calm in a high degree (Mr. Stearns uses the superlative), is not apt to lose those qualities by a mere change of subject. But Dr. Littledale, while possessed of some ability, has neither fairness nor calm-

ness. Not only Catholics, but even those of his own school have found fault with him for his unbecoming, virulent assault upon English converts, and his ungentlemanly invasion of the sacred circle of private life. And what Mr. Stearns forgot to mention, the English Church Union, which patronized Dr. Littledale's book at the beginning, has been compelled by public opinion to disclaim all responsibility for his statements. Nay, Dr. Littledale himself has been driven by the same power to withdraw his book, and to promise that if there be a second edition the offensive passages shall be expunged. Amongst the passages alluded to are, no doubt, the very ones Mr. Stearns has quoted.

And what, pray, has metamorphosed Dr. Littledale from what he once was, an ardent admirer of Rome, into her bitter enemy? The reason is well known in England. Dr. Littledale, in his overhasty eagerness to bring about a reconciliation between Anglicanism and Catholicity, took into his head to open negotiations with Rome, the effect of which was to be an acknowledgment of the supremacy of the Holy See by a good number of Anglican ministers, with their congregations, in return for some concessions that Rome was to make to national prejudices. He had no authority from his Church or its bishops; the latter he heartily despised as idle worldlings and Protestant to the core. He was a kind of self-constituted plenipotentiary or arbiter, rather dictating terms to both sides, Rome and Anglicanism. The end of it was what might be expected. As Rome's deposit of faith comes from Christ and His Apostles, and not from man, it is inviolable. She has nothing to surrender, nor can she treat with heretics, except on the one condition of repentance and submission. If Dr. Littledale's overtures were listened to at all, as no doubt they were, and with kindly patience and courtesy, he must have received this answer and nothing more, with perhaps the additional promise that disciplinary arrangements would be thought of, if necessary or desired, for those who should become docile children. So his self-assumed mission was a failure. *Hinc iræ.* This is the source of his lately born bitterness against Rome and Catholicity. And, unless there be a miracle of God's grace, this wounded pride will keep him preaching and writing against Rome, and doing all he can to hinder conversions and malign those who, to his dictation, prefer submission to the Holy See, down to that last hour when he will open his eyes in the presence of the Great Judge. Before that dread Tribunal he will have to account for many statements, amongst others for his twofold horrible slander: (1) that "converts to the Catholic Church from Protestantism in a great majority of cases lose their truthfulness," in plain terms become liars; and (2) that "he has been assured of this by the Roman Catholic clergy themselves." Mr. Stearns repeats the first, but wisely omits all mention of the second. It was too intrinsically incredible even for him.

There is nothing in the pamphlet's reply to "A. de G." that has not been refuted beforehand in that gentleman's article. It is only a rehash of what had been said in the *Faith of Our Forefathers*, with the same foul insinuations, the same tone of self-complacency, the same strange development of his peculiar self-consciousness. He thinks that whatever his adversary left unnoticed was cautiously avoided because it was unassailable, though he has raked and scraped together such an incongruous mass in a small space that it would take a volume three times the size to notice it even slightly. Yet he seems aggrieved that anything he says is passed over unnoticed. But what good has it done him that "A. de G." noticed and exposed his strange confusion of the knowledge derived from testimony and the knowledge derived from

science or intuition? "A. de G." aptly pointed out the great difference between them. Mr. Stearns does not see it yet, for he repeats the blunder once more in his pamphlet.

After this he attacks the criticism that appeared in the book notices of the REVIEW. Of course the critic is wrong throughout and Mr. Stearns is right everywhere. He is not pleased that the reviewer has failed to take up the sevenfold challenge addressed by him to Archbishop Gibbons. According to our old-fashioned notions a challenge can only be met or declined by the party challenged. He is further angry that the reviewer did not proclaim to his readers that Mr. Stearns gave in his book "eight distinct quotations from St. Ambrose, thirteen from St. Augustine, four from St. Cyprian, etc., not one of which does he venture to impugn." On the contrary, he thinks the reviewer very prudent in not attempting to refute any statement of his other choice witnesses, Irenæus Prime, Father Tom, the *Southern Churchman*, etc. We can only say that he seems to attach quite too much importance to whatever he says. He thinks, in his innocence, that his inept quotations from the Fathers, his own arguments in which slang and sophistry go together, his anecdotes, etc., culled from newspapers and viler sources, all alike strike terror into the heart of Rome. Let him enjoy his delusion, but let not his friends humor it too far.

An unfortunate allusion of the REVIEW to the "etc." on his title-page brings out a deluge of self-laudation, as to the books he wrote, the sermons he published, the articles he indited for two reviews, of one of which he was associate editor. He tells us their titles, and in some cases the number of pages, and how some of them were published by Waters and some by Lippincott, and how they "went across the water" and were "lauded and quoted" even in Great Britain! We take his word for it, and he ought to thank us for giving him this chance to spread before the world so much of his literary autobiography. But when it comes to giving us, as he does, for Gospel the eulogiums pronounced on him by the *Guardian*, *Churchman*, *Church Record*, *Christian Remembrancer*, and other Episcopalian papers, we see in his citing such witnesses the proof of gratified vanity, but nothing beyond this. It is the professional business of these papers to run down everything Catholic, and to laud everything, however worthless, that is written against Rome. No doubt, if he sends them a copy of his present pamphlet, they will admire it on paper and praise it as a production of great power, Attic wit, forcible logic, convincing argument, and more perhaps of this stereotyped rigmarole. To hate and abuse Romanism, as they call it, not to argue sensibly, is their measure of the goodness of a book. The more venomous his hatred, the fouler his abuse, the more praiseworthy the writer is considered. Were Chillingworth or Jeremy Taylor to reappear on earth, we doubt if their books would receive as warm a welcome or as enthusiastic praise as that mass of ignorance and stupidity lately rolled into book form by Secretary Thompson, who rants about the Man of Sin and knows as little of him as he does of a man-of-war.

Rev. Mr. Stearns was taken to task for a shameful blunder which he committed while altering or improving, as he perhaps thought, a line of Virgil's. His answer is quite characteristic. At first he confesses his error:

"Has the reviewer, then, no case against me? None but a case of bad grammar; the use (p. 309) of *oris* as the ablative plural of *os* . . . ; a delinquency so rudimentary (!) as to be powerless for harm to the delinquent, except on the score of *incuria*, uncarefulness. How came it about? Thus: it was my first attempt at Latin poetry, as it will probably be my last (a wise resolve!) when I get through with it, and I was

naturally anxious about the metre. In getting that right, I got the grammar WRONG. I steered clear of Scylla and ran straight upon Charybdis" (p. 10).

But scarcely had this confession escaped his pen than he repented it. Hence at the end of the same page he adds that, "it is not a case of bad grammar pure and simple, seeing that it is only by the context that it is determined to be bad grammar at all!" He goes on to contend that *ora* may have made *oris* in the ablative, since *vasa* makes *vasis*. That is to say, if one noun is heteroclite, so may all be. In other words, if *man* in English has the irregular plural *men*, what is to prevent us from making *pen* and *fen* the plurals of *pan* and *fan*? If such reasoning be once admitted, there is an end of grammar and of all correct writing. He magnanimously promises, however, not to avail himself of this reasoning, and will rather change his line to a spondaic

"centum linguis
Gaudentem."

If he had carefully read the old masters he would know that spondaic lines are not constructed on this model. On the next page he becomes still more ashamed of his weakness in having confessed himself in the wrong, and boldly maintains that he was right. "Gaudentem *oris* (he says) is good Latin. So is

centum multiloquacibus *oris*
Gaudentem

also: it is good grammar, good metre, and good sense: and it is highly poetical (and quite musical he should have added) into the bargain." What can you do with a man of this stamp? He is incorrigible. He has *ora*, *oris*, but no such word as *peccavi* in his Latin dictionary.

THE RELIGIOUS MISSION OF THE IRISH PEOPLE AND CATHOLIC COLONIZATION. By *J. L. Spalding, D.D.*, Bishop of Peoria, New York: The Catholic Publication Company, 1880.

The general purpose of this work, as stated by the author in his preface, is to enforce three points: First, that "the Irish Catholics are the most important element in the Church of this country." Second, that "their present surroundings and occupations are, for the most part, a hindrance to the fulfilment of the mission which God has given to them." Third, and as a necessary conclusion from the first two points, that "all honest attempts to bring about a redistribution of our Catholic population are commendable." Fourth, "that this most important object can best be furthered by movements such as that which the Irish Catholic Colonization Association of the United States is now promoting."

In the illustration and enforcement of these points, Bishop Spalding commences with a chapter on the spirit of the age and the special work of the Church with relation to it. He shows that the present age has turned its back upon the truth, heretofore admitted, that religion is intimately, inseparably "related to the intellectual, moral, and social life of mankind;" that the tendency now is to "isolate religion" and "eliminate supernatural faith from the motives of action." He shows the consequences of this "in the rapid moral decay, perceptible both in Europe and America;" and that nothing remains to the Church, in the face of this new paganism, "but to permit the dead to bury their dead, and so with less hindrance to follow in the footsteps of Christ and to preach his Gospel to the poor; to begin again, as he began, at the

bottom, with the little ones—with those who have an humble and a pure heart, for of such is His kingdom.”

The next chapter is devoted to an exhibition of “The Religious Mission of the Irish People.” Here the author shows that “God’s providence can prepare no higher destiny for a people than to make them the witnesses and apostles of the truth as revealed in Christ;” and that this is the special mission of the Irish people now, as it was in past ages.

The writer enforces this by a sketch of the history of Ireland. He then shows that though Protestantism seemed to have won a complete victory over Catholicism among all English-speaking peoples, yet the cause of Catholicism, at first slowly gathering strength after its seemingly complete defeat, has acquired a power during the present century, little less than marvellous throughout the whole English-speaking world; and that this change has been achieved mainly through the Irish people.

Referring to the United States, and supporting his statement with ample evidence, he says: “No other people could have done for the Catholic faith what the Irish people have done No other people had received the same providential training for this work; of no other people had God required such proofs of love.”

The next three chapters of the work before us are devoted to the explication of the fact that “the present surroundings and occupations” of the Irish people in the United States “are, for the most part, a hindrance to the fulfilment of the mission God has given to them.” From a careful examination of the statistics of the United States Census of 1870 he shows that:

“About eight in every hundred of our Irish Catholic population are on the land, though not all as owners of the soil. The remaining ninety-two out of every hundred are chiefly in the tenement-houses of our great commercial cities, in the cottages of the factory towns, in the huts of the mining regions, in the shanties on the railroads and public works of the country, or living as domestic servants in the houses of the wealthy. *A worse condition of affairs, so far as the welfare of the Irish people and the future of the Catholic religion in this country are concerned, I can hardly imagine.*”

Taking the statistics of New York city, Bishop Spalding proves (and the same facts are true of our other great cities, though to a somewhat less extent) that in 1870 there were upwards of sixteen thousand tenement-houses in that city inhabited by a population of over half a million, by far the greater portion of which was Irish and Irish-American. He shows the utter futility of legislative enactments and sanitary and philanthropic efforts to put an end to this deplorable state of things; that “the best measures are only palliative, because wretchedness is the inevitable lot of the mode of life which modern industrialism in our cities and factory towns develops;” that “the only effective word is that which God bade Moses speak to the children of Israel: . . . ‘And I have said the word to bring you forth out of the affliction of Egypt into a land that floweth with milk and honey.’”

In the next two chapters Bishop Spalding shows what is the work of the Church in the United States, what it comprehends, and how it may be most effectually performed. He shows how, in our cities and factory towns, there is, in the words of Dr. Engel, the Director of the Royal Statistical Bureau of Berlin, “in spite of the philanthropic efforts of individuals, and the heroic endeavors of many employers,” a constant “sacrifice of human beings to Capital—a consumption of men, which,

by the wasting of the vital forces of individuals, by the weakening of whole generations, by the breaking up of families, by the ruin of morality, and the destruction of the joyousness of work, has brought civilized society into the most imminent peril."

"Nine-tenths of the Irish and their descendants," says Bishop Ireland, "are being offered up as human sacrifices in this temple of Mammon, the master idol of the age, and yet we Catholics are all the while congratulating ourselves upon the great progress we are making in this country." He refutes various objections to Catholic colonization, makes a number of valuable practical suggestions as to the proper organization of associations to aid the movement, and urges it upon the attention and favorable consideration of the Catholic public, both as a means for rescuing thousands from the fiery temptations and dangers to which they are now exposed, and of diffusing the faith and extending the Church.

We have already extended our notice beyond allowed limits, and must dismiss the writer's sketches of "Irish Scenes and English Rule in Ireland," which make up the remainder of the volume before us, with the single remark that each, in its own way, and with relation to the subject treated, is interesting and instructive.

GEOLOGICAL EXPLORATION OF THE FORTIETH PARALLEL. Clarence King, Geologist-in-charge. Six vols., with Topographical and Geological Atlas. Washington, Government Printing Office.

There are few public works so remunerative to a state as a complete geological survey of its territories; yet I doubt whether there is any that has been so long neglected by governments, or so indifferently performed when undertaken. The United States offer a very gratifying exception to the rule; for if we take into consideration the short time that has elapsed since she could attempt to organize great national works, as well as the amount of really unexplored land within her limits, and then compare the results already obtained by her officers with those obtained in any of the countries of Europe, the showing will be in our favor by a very large ratio. In this comparison I do not take account of what has been done in this direction by individual States, as New York, Pennsylvania, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Ohio, Virginia, California, Wisconsin, North Carolina, etc., etc., the geological reports of whose surveys compare favorably with those of any country in the world; it will be sufficient to enumerate the several expeditions that have from time to time been fitted out by the central government at Washington for the survey of the Territories. Of these the most important are the expeditions for the survey of the Colorado of the West, and the Uinta Mountains, under Powell; the expedition for the geological survey of the United States Territories, under Hayden; that under Lieutenant Wheeler, of the corps of engineers, United States Army, for the geographical survey west of the one hundredth meridian; and, finally, that under King, for the geological survey of the fortieth parallel. For many reasons, not necessary to advance or discuss here, the work done on the fortieth parallel survey is the most thorough and satisfactory, and, in many respects, the most important geological work yet done in the United States; hence these reports have been chosen for the present notice. Later on I hope to be able to notice the work done under Lieutenant Wheeler.

Mr. King took the field in 1867. He had associated with him as assistants the brothers J. D. and Arnold Hague and S. F. Emmons, who had been previously engaged on the survey of California. The palæontology was worked up by such specialists as Meek, Hall, and Whitfield;

the botany by Watson ; the ornithology by Ridgway ; the microscopical examination of the volcanic rocks by Professor Zirkel of Leipsic ; and the greater part of the topography was under the direction of J. T. Gardner.

The first volume that appeared was vol. iii., accompanied by its detailed atlas of plans, etc., illustrating the "Mining Industry" of the fortieth parallel district. This volume is for the most part a detailed description of the Comstock lode. At the time it was issued the lowest level did not reach below 1000 feet ; the depth at present is almost 3000 feet, and the temperature of water at the bottom is about 160 degrees F. It is very gratifying, and it seems to me in the interests of science, that Mr. King has been enabled by his present position of director of the United States geological survey, to resume in the mines of this district, with which he is so well acquainted, the investigations concerning temperature, productiveness, and mode of formation, which he grappled with so thoroughly in the early part of the survey, but which could not be completed then, both for want of data and want of time.

Vol. v., on "Botany," appeared in 1871 ; vol. vi., on "Microscopical Petrography," and the atlas to accompany the reports, were issued in 1876 ; vol. iv., on "Palæontology and Ornithology," and vol. ii., on the "Descriptive Geology of the Survey," appeared in 1877 ; and vol. i., entitled "Systematic Geology," was issued in 1878.

Vol. ii. was written by Messrs. Hague and Emmons. In their letter to the geologist-in-charge they draw attention to the great difficulties that had to be overcome in the survey of a region where topography and geology had to go hand in hand, and so endeavor by anticipation to excuse the shortcomings of their work. The precaution was unnecessary ; the work was gone through with great care and skill, and the result is a most valuable contribution to practical and theoretical geology alike.

Vol. i. was written entirely by Mr. King. In it he reviews, or "systematizes" the entire work of the survey according to the relative ages of the formations. He subjects each to a careful analytical study, and deduces therefrom, as far as can be, the essential points of its history. How far he has succeeded more detailed observation will prove ; with what skill and care he has performed his work, even the most cursory reader of his pages can readily testify. He examines each exposure separately, beginning with the archæan and going through the whole series, the palæozoic, the mesozoic and the cainozoic, and ending with the quaternary. He has most interesting chapters on the "Genesis of Granite and Crystalline Schists ;" "The Correlation of Tertiary Volcanic Rocks ;" "Fusion, Genesis, and Classification of Volcanic Rocks ;" and finally one on "Orography." In this last chapter Mr. King endeavors to account for volcanic action by the factor of erosion. This theory, though not yet proven, has never been *successfully* called in question, and bids fair at present to solve the enigma of volcanic outflow. In a note to vol. ii., as well as in a table in chapter vi. of vol. i., may be found a method of description that will help to give, at a glance, a clear idea of the gigantic proportions of the work done. There are 50,000 feet of archæan, 32,000 feet of palæozoic, 30,000 feet of mesozoic, and 15,000 feet of cainozoic, giving a total of some 127,000 feet of rocks. These had to be examined in place, in every exposure occurring in a belt 100 miles wide, and extending from the 104th to the 120th meridians. Specimens representing them were afterwards scrupulously analyzed in the laboratory, their determinations verified, their descriptions published ; they were carefully transported to and deposited in a suitable resting-place, where they will be within easy reach of the stu-

dent of natural history. Such is the great work that has been so well performed by Mr. King and his assistants, a work of which they may well be proud, and which reflects equal credit on them and the United States government, under whose direction it was performed.

ÉTUDES SYNTHÉTIQUES DE GÉOLOGIE EXPÉRIMENTALE. Par A. DAUBRÉE, member de l'Institut, Directeur de l'Ecole Nationale des Mines, etc., etc. Paris, Dunod, 1879.

The present volume is a reunion of the many papers and monographs published by the author, during the last thirty years, relative to experiments conducted by him, illustrating the most important geological phenomena. The great facilities for observation of these phenomena afforded by his position of Director-General of the Mines, and the unlimited resource for experiment placed under his control, give his essay an importance not attained by those of any who preceded him in the same field of inquiry. The present volume he calls "Part First; or The Application of the Experimental Method to the Study of the Various Geological Phenomena." A second volume is in preparation, which will be "Part Second; or, The Experimental Study of the Various Cosmic Phenomena." The aim of this second volume is to give some account of the constitution of meteorites, and of the essential characters of the bolides by which they are conveyed to our earth from space.

Some idea of the extent and scope of the present essay may be gathered from a simple enumeration of the principal questions treated: metaliferous deposits; crystalline, metamorphic, and eruptive rocks; volcanic phenomena; fissures, joints, and faults in the earth's crust; schistose and cleavage structure in rocks; folding of the earth's crust; formation of mountain chains, etc. Thus it will be seen that all the principal difficulties of chemical, physical, and mechanical or dynamical geology are treated; and it is very pleasing to the student of natural history that these points are treated not merely hypothetically, nor with a view to prove or defend any peculiar ideas of the author, but solely with a view to ascertain what may be learned from experiments performed under conditions, and on material, as similar to those in nature as it is possible for the laboratory to afford. Considering the disparity of proportion and resource between the most complete chemical laboratory and that of nature, it is evident that none of the experiments here described have the force of demonstration. In most cases, however, they throw such light on the points they illustrate, that they are as good as demonstrated to the student of geology.

The most interesting sections are those describing the artificial production of some of the most important minerals. By the production of crystals of the oxides of titanium and tin, the whole problem as to the mode of formation of the metallic veins, that had for so long a time previously been an enigma to the geologist, was solved. In the chapter on metamorphism it is shown that the internal heat of the globe cannot be a sufficient cause of the phenomena presented by metamorphic rocks. For if it were, then the phenomena should have been produced in accordance with the law of the propagation of heat, now so well established; but experience proves the contrary. Neither can the internal heat, aided by certain vapors or gases, such as chlorine, sulphur, and carbon, account for them. But water raised to a very high temperature, aided by the pressure of overlying rock masses, is shown to be the only agency that is capable of producing results so diverse, and, at times, so apparently incompatible. The thermal springs of the

present day are a proof of this, as not only the rocks through which the waters flow, but even the materials of the mason-work of conduits, formed within our own times, are so far metamorphosed in their structure and constitution, as to be readily confounded with true metamorphic or eruptive rocks, when examined in their sections under the microscope. A still further proof of this theory is the fact that some of the mineral species peculiar to metamorphic rocks have been produced in the laboratory by the use of high pressure and superheated steam. The experiments are very simple as to detail, and are well worthy the attention of those interested in this department of scientific research. A glass tube partially filled with water, heated to a very high temperature and subjected to a pressure of about one thousand atmospheres are the essential elements of the experiment. As a matter of precaution against the possibility of fusion of the glass tubes, these latter were incased in tubes of iron containing water. In this way crystals of quartz were produced possessing all the characters of natural crystals, as well as some perfect crystals of pyroxene. A piece of wood treated in this way became anthracite.

The sections treating of the foldings of the earth's crust are very interesting just at this moment, when almost every novice geologist sets himself to account for the mode of formation of mountain chains, valleys and volcanos, as if there were nothing easier within the whole domain of science. The experiments described are very simple and very instructive; they contain no proofs, but point, as it were, to the necessity of controlling theory by experiment. There are other very interesting chapters on the mechanism of volcanoes, and the schistose structure of rocks, that will repay careful study.

The entire work, of some five hundred pages, embracing the principal theoretical points in geology, is a grand monument to its author. It is the only textbook we possess on experimental geology. From its appearance will date the birth of a new branch of science.

GOD AND MAN. Conferences delivered at the Notre Dame in Paris, by the *Rev. Père Lacordaire*, of the Order of Friar-Precachers. Translated from the French, with the Author's permission, by a Tertiary of the same Order. New York: P. O'Shea. 1879. 8vo., pp. 244.

LACORDAIRE'S LETTERS TO YOUNG MEN. Edited by Count Montalembert. Translated by the *Rev. James Trenor*. New York: P. O'Shea. 1880. 8vo.

The Conferences of the great Dominican orator will always be attractive to a wide circle of readers. There are few, if any, who can fail to admire his graceful, captivating eloquence, even if they cannot sufficiently appreciate his deep masculine thought, the bold energy with which he seizes the great fundamental principles of divine truth, and the dextrous tact, the delicacy, the ease, with which he handles these massive subjects for the benefit of his audience. His words will furnish abundant matter to be thought over by one who reads, or by him who has to speak. Indeed, were it not for the matchless oratory that accompanied the living voice, we think that as a rule his readers must have derived from them even more profit than his hearers.

More agreeable reading, if not so profound, will be found in his *Letters to Young Men*. This volume, which we owe to the solicitude of his friend, Count Montalembert, reveals the true soul of Lacordaire. It discloses rich depths of tenderness, gentleness, and sensibility. It accounts for the unbounded influence he possessed over the souls of his friends, of all indeed who came into contact with him, especially the young, in

whom a premature cynicism, induced by vice and unbelief, had not crushed the aspirations of nature and silenced the voice of God. It explains, too, why every word of his, whether of compassion, encouragement, even rebuke (he could do this, at times plainly and sternly, but always lovingly; see p. 283), was welcomed with such delight by his friends and correspondents.

Lacordaire, though addicted to what some call "liberal" views, was penetrated by a deep feeling of Catholic faith and the necessity this involves of submission to the Holy See. This it was that saved him in 1834 from sliding into the abyss with his friend and teacher, La Menais, whose indomitable pride caused him to fall, like Satan, from almost an archangel's height, and to lose his soul in the lowest depths of irreligion. Shuddering at the spiritual and moral ruin of his teacher, and his own narrow escape, he thought of coming to the United States and engaging in missionary work. But Providence had other designs on him, and he remained in France to introduce there the Dominican Order and labor in the pulpit for the conversion of unbelievers. We should like to give a few extracts, that the reader might form some idea of the style of these *Letters* and their translation, but we must restrict ourselves to one or two. Speaking of the freedom of opinion that even in religious matters may coexist with implicit obedience to Church authority, he says:

"You will, perhaps, ask why God has left so many questions open to discussion. You might as well ask why God has not revealed everything. Now God has revealed the principles in order to serve as foundations. He has not done exactly the same with the consequences, in order to give our liberty play, like a mother who holds her child up by leading strings, but is delighted to see him try and walk like a man. . . . The liberty of her children gives her (the Church) no uneasiness, for she knows on the one hand the point at which she will check them, and on the other she is certain they will stop at her bidding. It is much the same feeling as that of God about the ocean. On the contrary, Protestant liberty recognizes no bounds and is destructive of all unity. The Protestant has not a single dogma to serve as a centre of unity or a rallying-point. He is his own unity; in other words, his unity is something essentially variable, a cloud, a dewdrop;" (p. 48).

THE MYSTERY OF THE CROWN OF THORNS: Prefigured in the Old Testament, Accomplished in the Passion of Our Lord Jesus Christ, and Revived in the Church during the last Seven Centuries. With Practical Devotions, by a Passionist Father, the author of the "Christian Trumpet," "Voice of Jesus Suffering," etc. New York. D. & J. Sadlier & Co., 1879. 12mo., pp. 637.

The author of this book is Rev. F. Gaudentius Rossi, C. P.; and since one of the objects for which his Order was instituted is to cherish and spread devotion to the Passion of our Lord, nothing could be more appropriate than a book of this kind from one of his religious profession. The remembrance of Christ's Passion and Death has ever been for the Church the central point round which revolve not only her highest worship and most solemn rites, but also the liveliest affections and warmest piety of her faithful children. And as the rich germ of Catholic devotion unfolded itself, out of it there grew a natural impulse to do fitting reverence to all the mute memorials of Calvary's great mystery, to everything that had once surrounded the cross "on which hung the salvation of the world." This was the origin of that veneration, extended from the earliest days by the Christian people to the instruments

of His sufferings, a veneration approved of in many ways by the Church. And it has been chiefly in these late days, when "the charity of many has grown cold," that God has raised up pious souls to restore its life and warmth by renewing and propagating this special devotion not only to the Passion, but to all of its adjuncts that could help to bring it more vividly and effectually before the minds and hearts of the faithful.

To do his part in spreading this devotion, the reverend author has taken up the Crown of Thorns; and his title-page is sufficient clew to his division of the subject. In the first place he discusses those figures of the Old Testament which may be considered emblematic of the painful crown worn by the divine victim of God's justice. Nor are these chosen arbitrarily, though there is nothing to prevent individual piety, under the safeguard of Christian prudence, from tracing in the Old Testament varied types of the beauties and treasures contained in the New. The author insists chiefly on those that have been pointed out and so far commended by the Church in her office of the "Sacred Crown of Thorns" set apart for the first Friday of Lent. He next examines the moral and spiritual meaning of this sacred crown. Here, interspersed with sound theology and much curious historical information, the reader will find many pertinent remarks on the evils of our time and the great questions that are vexing the present world in Europe, and to some extent in our own country. In the third place he treats of the "mystical crown of thorns that our Lord has imparted to some saints," in other words, the share in His sufferings that He has allowed to some chosen souls. A list of the servants of God who have been thus privileged in every century is given from trustworthy sources. The Catholic Church neither parades these miracles nor attempts to explain them. It is enough for her to know that the Most High is wonderful in all His works, but especially in His saints. *Mirabilia opera Altissimi: Mirabilis Deus in Sanctis suis.*

GREAT LIGHTS IN SCULPTURE AND PAINTING:—A Manual for Young Students. By S. D. Doremus. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1880. 8vo., pp. 218.

A book, not of much pretensions, but containing a good deal of information that may be useful to students, as it is for the most part compiled from good sources. But the author, we are sorry to see, is not content with instruction on his subject; he must go farther, and either humor the religious prejudices of the reader or try to instil them into him; and this at the expense of truth as well as propriety. Having occasion to mention St. Dominic's tomb by Niccolo Pisano, he throws in this parenthesis: "This Saint is renowned for the establishment of the Inquisition, the tortures of which were so mercilessly carried on by his followers, the Dominican monks" (p. 55). What called for this item of news? Did he speak (as he does) of Napoleon Bonaparte, would he think it necessary to add that he was born in Corsica or lived an exile in Elba, or was divorced from Josephine? No, his own notions of propriety would have prevented the intrusion of such extraneous matter. But besides not being *ad rem*, it is not true. St. Dominic never established the Inquisition, nor does any reputable historian assert it. He fought against heresy, not with the sword but with more Christian weapons, with penance, tears, prayer, and instruction, as we learn from his first biographers. Even had he been appointed an inquisitor, which is not likely, this would not justify the assertion that he established the Inquisition. Many judges, many governors of Western Territories have been appointed from time to time. But of none of them can it be properly said that they have established the judicial bench or territorial

government. And in what volume outside of romance or his own fertile imagination did he learn that Dominican monks acted as executioners? or that the general (Bourbon) whose brutal horde sacked Rome in 1527 was a cardinal! Equally curious is the statement (p. 184) that "the extreme unction administered by the Romish Church was given by friends who still clustered about him" to Salvator Rosa on his death-bed. There is nothing here that is ill-meant, but it exemplifies the folly of presuming to write off-hand on matters with which one has no acquaintance whatsoever.

SPIRITUAL PROGRESS. By *J. W. Cummings, D.D., LL.D.*, of St. Stephen's Church, New York City. New edition. New York: P. O'Shea. 12mo., pp. 330.

It was a good idea of the publisher to reprint this little work of Dr. Cummings, which made its first appearance more than twenty years ago, and was then very favorably received by the public. It consists of reflections, accompanied by practical advice and counsel, on various points of religion, morality, character, etc.

The title is not, perhaps, sufficiently expressive of the contents. The writer's aim is not to maintain the cause of religious truth against its enemies, so that no one need expect to find in it argument or controversy. It is, however, in one sense a defence of religion, for it beautifully sets forth the holy and ennobling influences of Christianity on individual life and social intercourse; and nothing can illustrate its divine character more forcibly than this simple exposition. Neither, as some might suspect from the title, is it an ascetical work, a manual of meditation for the closet or of private devotion. It is a book that may be read everywhere and at all times, in hours of study or of relaxation. It is suited to every one, the student and the man of the busy world. And it will please every one, for it is characterized by broad, manly good sense, correct and deep thought, with the additional charm of a style that is always pleasing and not unfrequently eloquent.

It was, we repeat, a happy thought of Mr. O'Shea to give us a new edition of Dr. Cummings's book, and we hope his venture will be crowned with success. He richly deserves it. He is one of the few business men whose financial reverses have not only left his honor untarnished, but have increased, if possible, the estimation in which he has been ever held by the business community.

THE CHURCH OF THE PARABLES AND TRUE SPOUSE OF THE SUFFERING SAVIOUR.
By *Joseph Prachensky*, Priest of the Society of Jesus. New York: The Catholic Publication Society. 1880.

This little work is written for a special purpose. Its object is to present to Protestants who profess to respect and revere the sacred Scriptures the evidences contained in the parables of Our Divine Lord that "no other than the Holy Roman Catholic Church, as it was and is, can be the Church of the Bible;" and that "many things beautifully represented in Scripture as belonging to this Church are rejected by the so-called Reformers, though drawn and ordained by the master-hand of our Divine Redeemer himself." Only those parables, therefore, have been "selected for exposition that relate to Catholic dogmas controverted by the sects," passing over "those which contain only lessons of morality that are not impugned or denied by any who call themselves Christians. In accordance with this plan the Parables chosen are those of the Good Samaritan, the Good Seed and the Cockle, the Grain of Mus-

tard-seed, the Parable of the Leaven, the Pearls of the Net, the Scribe, the Pharisee, and the Publican, the Prodigal Son, and the Marriage Feast.

The truths referring to the Church, its nature, mission, unity, and catholicity, its being the divinely established dispenser of divine grace, its being the divinely constituted authoritative teacher of revealed truth, its being the veritable "tabernacle of God with men," where Christ is really present, and kindred truths contained in the parables selected, are set forth by the author in a lucid and forcible manner. The utter irrecconcilability, too, of Protestantism with these truths is also clearly shown. The second part of the volume is occupied with showing, first, that "the persecution to which the Catholic Church is subjected in all ages is an infallible proof that she is the only true Church of Christ;" and, secondly, that, "as the sufferings of Christ proved His divinity and accomplished what the prophets had foretold, so it is by suffering that the Church reaches her destiny and shall be glorified with Him."

THE CHRISTIAN MOTHER: The Education of her Children and her Prayer. From the German of *Rev. W. Cramer*. Translated by a Father of the Society of Jesus, with the permission of Superiors. New York, Cincinnati, and St. Louis: Benziger Brothers, 1880.

The Christian mother, in whatever sphere, however humble her condition in life, has a great dignity and a high vocation of her own. She is in education the element of primary importance, and on her proper education of the children depends the welfare of the family, of society, and of the state. It would be well if all mothers were deeply conscious of the lofty trust committed to their hands and proportionately faithful in its discharge.

This little book is designed to remind them of their many duties or concurrent parts of one great duty, and to afford them help and counsel how best to perform them. The author lays down vividly, and with not unnecessary plainness, the many difficulties that beset a proper Christian education of the young, owing to the many dangers by which childhood is environed from the very cradle, the negligence, excessive indulgence, and too often the bad example of parents, and gives some wholesome admonitions on these and other points. There are in the end some excellent prayers and pious practices for Christian mothers, amongst others a useful method of assisting at the Holy Sacrifice for their own benefit and that of their children.

SHORT MEDITATIONS FOR EVERY DAY IN THE YEAR, intended chiefly for the Use of Religious. By an anonymous Italian author. Translated by *Dom Edmund J. Luck, O.S.B.*, Priest of the Cassinese Congregation of the Primitive Observance. Prefaced by a recommendation of His Eminence, Cardinal Manning. New York and Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet. 1879.

The wisdom of the Church in its yearly round of Sacred Seasons and the ever-varying significance of its Solemnities and Feasts is shown in countless ways. Annually "the whole Revelation of the Faith returns, mystery by mystery, dogma by dogma, precept by precept, upon our intelligence and upon our hearts. The *Lex credandi* is the *Lex orandi*, and the worship of the Church preaches to the world without, and to the faithful within the sanctuary." The best Manuals of Devotion are those that follow the Church as it moves through the Liturgical year. The Manual before us does this. It is a simple and edifying exposition of the eternal truths in which and by which we must live and persevere to a holy death. To use the words of His Eminence, Cardinal Man-

ning, who warmly recommends this Manual, "Every one, in every state in the world, in the Priesthood and in the Cloister what is enough for perfection ; for perfection consists in the love of God and our neighbor."

STUMBLING-BLOCKS MADE STEPPING-STONES ON THE ROAD TO THE CATHOLIC FAITH. By the *Rev. James F. Moriarty, A.M.*, Pastor of St. Patrick's Church, Chatham Village. New York : The Catholic Publication Society, Barclay Street, 1880.

"From his own personal experience," the author tells us in his preface, "during frequent and almost daily intercourse with persons who are not of the household of faith," he has learned that most of the objections against the Church are based on mistaken notions of her doctrines. He has selected, therefore, as subjects for explanation in this volume, the Mass, the Confessional, the Intercession of Saints, Devotion to the Blessed Virgin, Purgatory, and Infallibility, because these are more frequently assailed and more generally misunderstood.

The style is clear and sprightly, and the work is calculated to do great good, both as a source of instruction to Catholics, and a means by which non-Catholics, willing to learn the truth as regards the Catholic religion, may be enlightened.

SHADOWS OF THE ROOD ; or Types of our Suffering Redeemer, Jesus Christ, occurring in the Book of Genesis. Being the substance of a series of moral discourses, delivered in the Church of the Assumption, during the Lent of 1856. By the *Rev. John Bonus, B.D., Ph. et LL.D.* Second American Edition. Revised and corrected by the author. Baltimore : John Murphy & Co., 1878.

Devotion to the Cross is the life and soul of all devotion. Discourses, therefore, which explain, so far as they can be explained, and bring home to the mind and heart of the hearer or reader the profound yet precious mysteries comprehended in the passion and death of our Divine Redeemer, touch upon subjects of the deepest interest to every Christian. The little volume before us consists of such discourses. They are exegetical as bringing out the mystical significance of prominent personages under the Old Law, and showing that they were types which our Saviour fulfilled. At the same time these discourses are also moral, in that their chief object is to incite the readers to progress in Christian virtue.

THE LIFE OF ST. BENEDICT, PATRIARCH OF THE WESTERN MONKS. Translated from the Second Book of the Dialogues of St. Gregory the Great, Supreme Pontiff. By *P. Aurelius McMahon, O.S.B., Permissu Superiorum.* Baltimore : John Murphy & Co., 1880.

The life of a saint, written by a saint, cannot fail to be both instructive and edifying. The work before us has been so highly appreciated and commended in all generations, that it would be superfluous for us to say a word in its praise. It is brief and concise, but its every chapter and page and line is redolent of piety, unction, and the spirit of God. It is a model, too, of simplicity, and has, moreover, a special value as historical evidence of the belief and prevailing religious spirit of the Christian world thirteen hundred years ago, particularly with regard to miracles, the necessity and merit of self-mortification, humility, meditation, and prayer.

SKETCHES OF THE LIVES OF DOMINICAN SAINTS. By *M. K.* Dublin ; M. H. Gill & Son. 1880.

No more interesting, instructive or edifying reading can be found

than the lives of those who, through self-mortification, prayer, meditation, and persevering, heroic striving against sin, have attained perfect sanctity. The little work before us consists of brief yet clear, and in their way, complete sketches of Dominican saints of past ages, and of the companions and disciples of St. Dominic. They bring clearly before the reader the spirit of that grand religious order, and the labors and achievements of its founder and many of his most distinguished followers.

THE METAPHYSICS OF THE SCHOOL. By *Thomas Harper, S. J.* London: McMillan & Co. 1879. 8vo., pp. 592, with pp. lxxx of Introduction.

This is one of the most important books that has appeared in English Catholic literature for a long time, and it must be hailed as a most welcome help to the study of scholastic philosophy. The author's attempt to give in English the scholastic terminology is itself a great enterprise, and his success is astonishing. The matter of which he treats is so vast and important that we must reserve it for fuller criticism in our next.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

THE PASSION PLAY AT OBERAMMERGAU, IN THE SUMMER OF 1871. By the *Rev. Gerald Malloy, D.D.* Fourth edition. London: Burns & Oates. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1880.

VOICES FROM THE HEART: SACRED POEMS. By *Sister May Alphonsus Downing*, of the Third Order of St. Dominic, author of *Meditations and Prayers in Honor of St. Catharine of Sienna and other Saints*. New and enlarged edition. Revised by Right Rev. Doctor Leahey, Bishop of Dromore. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1880.

THE LAST MONARCH OF TARA: A TALE OF IRELAND IN THE SIXTH CENTURY. By *Eblona*. Revised and corrected by the Very Rev. U. J. Canon Bourke, M.R.I.A. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1880.

THE LIFE OF REV. CHARLES NERINCKX: With a Chapter on the Early Catholic Missions of Kentucky; Copious Notes on the Progress of Catholicity in the United States of America, from 1800 to 1825; an Account of the Establishment of the Society of Jesus in Missouri; and an Historical Sketch of the Sisterhood of Loretto in Kentucky, Missouri, New Mexico, etc. By *Rev. Camillus Maes*, Priest of the Diocese of Detroit. Cincinnati: Robert Clark & Co. 1880. A very interesting work, received when the last pages of the REVIEW were going to press.

CEREMONIAL INSTITUTIONS: *Being Part IV. of the Principles of Sociology.* By *Herbert Spencer*. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1880.

BLONID. By *Robert D. Joice*, author of *Deidre*. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 1879.

THE CRAYFISH: AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF ZOOLOGY. By *T. H. Huxley, F.R.S.* With eighty-two illustrations. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1880.

LIFE OF ERASMUS DARWIN. By *Ernst Krouse*. Translated from the German by *W. S. Dallas*. With a Preliminary Notice, by *Charles Darwin*. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1880.

LAYS AND LEGENDS OF THOMOND. With Historical and Traditional Notes. By *Michael Thomond*. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. 1880.

THE PATHOLOGY OF MIND. Being the third edition of the second part of *The Physiology and Pathology of the Mind*, recast, enlarged and rewritten. By *Henry Maudsley, M.D.* New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1880.

THE REFUTATION OF DARWINISM. By *T. Warren O'Neill*, Member of the Philadelphia Bar. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1880.

